

THE

# Churchman's Magazine.

VOL. 6.]

MARCH AND APRIL, 1809.

[No. 2.]

## BIOGRAPHY.

### LIFE OF WILLIAM LOWTH, B. D.

*Author of the Commentary on the Prophets, and Father of Dr.  
ROBERT LOWTH, late Bishop of London.*

WILLIAM Lowth, the excellent author of the above mentioned and several other valuable works, was born in the parish of St. Martin, Ludgate, September 11, 1661. His father was a great sufferer by the dreadful fire of London in 1666. At the time of this calamity, his son William was in Berkshire, under the care of his grandfather, Mr. Simon Lowth, Rector of Tyleshurst, in that county; to whom he had probably been sent the year before, on account of the plague then raging in the city. His grandfather took great care of his education, and initiated him very early in letters. He was afterwards sent to Merchant Taylor's School in London, where he made so great a proficiency in learning, that he was elected thence into St. John Baptist's College, Oxford, in June, 1675, being then not fourteen years of age. His eminent worth and learning recommended him to the favour of Dr. Peter Mew, Bishop of Winchester, who had been President of St. John's College. This prelate made him his chaplain, and conferred upon him a prebend in his cathedral, in the year 1696, and the rectory of Buriton, with the chapel of Petersfield, in Hampshire, in 1699. Thus situated in life, the labours of Mr. Lowth appear to have been strictly confined within the limits of his own province, and applied solely to the peculiar duties of his function: yet, in order that he might acquit himself the better in theology, he had pursued his studies with a more general and extensive view. Few were more deeply versed in criticism; there being scarcely

any ancient author, Latin or Greek, ecclesiastical or profane, especially the former, which he had not read with the most accurate attention; and this enabled him to oblige some of the most learned men of his time, with many valuable critical communications.

His works are, 1. "Directions for the profitable reading of the Holy Scriptures." 2. "A Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Old and New Testament," in answer to a Treatise of M. Le Clerc, on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; which, in 1699, was followed by a second edition, with amendments and a new preface. 3. Two sermons preached in the cathedral of Winchester, at the assizes in 1714, entitled, "Religion the distinguishing Character of Human Nature, on Job xxviii. 28;" and "The Wisdom of acknowledging Divine Revelation, on Matt. xi. 10." 4. "A Commentary on the Prophet Isaiah," 4to. London, 1714. 5. "On Jeremiah," 1718. 6. "On Ezekiel," 1723. 7. "On Daniel and the minor Prophets," 1726. These commentaries were afterwards republished together, with additions, in one volume folio, as a continuation of Bishop Patrick's Commentary, in which form it has had several editions. 8. "The Characters of an Apostolical Church fulfilled in the Church of England, and our Obligations to continue in the Communion of it: a Sermon preached in the Church of Petersfield," 1722. This drew him reluctantly into some controversy with Mr. Norman, a dissenting minister of Portsmouth; but he soon dropped it; partly because he did not think that he had a candid adversary; partly, reflecting that the cause had been already managed by some of the greatest divines, with all the advantages that could be derived to it from strength of reason and calmness of temper, yet with little success; and being anxious, moreover, for that leisure which was necessary for the prosecuting of his Commentary on the Prophets.

The most valuable part of his character was what least appeared in the eye of the world, the private and retired part, that of the good Christian and the useful Parish priest. His unaffected piety and most exemplary life; his diligence, assiduity, and zeal in the duties of his function; his hospitality, and constant readiness in performing all the offices of kindness, whether of admonition, advice, or assistance to his parishioners, gave all the recommendation and weight that could be ad-

ded to the most earnest exhortations from the pulpit. He married Margaret, the daughter of Robert Pitt, Esq. of Blandford, in the county of Dorset, by whom he had three daughters and two sons, of whom the eldest was the Rev. William Lowth, M. A. Prebendary of Winchester, and Vicar of Lewisham in Kent; the other was Dr. Robert Lowth, late Bishop of London, whose admirable writings and exemplary life rendered him one of the greatest ornaments of his age.

By his own order, Mr. Lowth was buried in the Churchyard of his parish at Buriton, where he died, near the south side of the chancel, and on the inside wall was erected a plain monument, with the following inscription:

Near the outside of this wall  
Lieth the body of Mr. WILLIAM LOWTH,  
Late Rector of this Church,  
Who died May 17, 1732;  
And being dead, still desires to speak  
To his beloved Parishioners,  
And earnestly to exhort them  
Constantly to attend upon the Worship of God,  
Frequently to receive the Holy Sacrament,  
And diligently to observe the good Instructions  
Given in this place;  
To breed up their Children in the Fear of God,  
And to follow Peace with all Men,  
And Holiness,  
Without which no Man shall see the Lord.  
God give us all a happy meeting  
At the Resurrection of the Just.



[*The following exhibits the character of a real Christian; one who lived a life of faith and abounded in good works; who displayed all the graces of the Holy Spirit, neither obscured by lukewarmness, nor alloyed by enthusiasm. The contemplation of such characters tends to impress on us the power and excellence of real religion. Let every professing Christian desire to feel its power, and in the humble and holy virtues of his life endeavour to display its excellence.*]

*Excellent Character of Mr. WILLIAM ALLEN, from the funeral Sermon preached at St. Martin's, Outwich, in August, 1686, by Dr. RICHARD KIDDER, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells.*

**I** DO not intend to borrow any topics for his praise from his country or descent, from his quality or rank, as he was a citizen of this great city; I need not go so far out of the way. He was valuable upon greater accounts than these; he was a citizen of a better city, that of GOD; he was an old and faithful disciple of Jesus, a great lover of God and of righteousness. This is more than all his other properties. Our dear friend was a great lover, and a most devout worshipper of God. He did it in public, he did it in his family, he did it in his closet. He did with great reverence attend upon the public prayers, hearing of the word; and frequently he received the holy sacrament. He taught his children and servants to serve God: a true child of Abraham the friend of God, he kept up a sense of God in his family, and had his retirements and holy privacies.

He spent great portions of his time in retirement; he was a most diligent inquirer after truth; he sought wisdom as silver, and searched for her as for hid treasures; nor did his labour prove in vain, for he did understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God: God had given him a great and clear understanding, a solid judgment and ability, and he improved his talent to a very great purpose.

He read the holy scriptures with wonderful care and diligence; attained to great understanding of the more abstruse parts of them; and though he had not the advantage of the



learned languages to direct him, yet by acquainting himself with those who had, and by indefatigable diligence, he did arrive at so great a measure of knowledge of those things which they do contain, as would be very commendable in a well-studied divine. He wrote several excellent books, that need no recommendation to the world;\* they are well known, and well esteemed, and the greatest clerk will have no cause to be ashamed to have them placed among the other authors with which he is furnished.

The arguments he chose were weighty, and of great use to the world: he designed to detect iniquity, enthusiasm, and superstition, which had corrupted the religion of Jesus: he persuaded men to unity and peace, and to shun all schism and faction: he endeavoured to reduce those who were gone astray, and to mind them of the divine assistance, and to persuade them to the profoundest humility; and to comfort good men with a just expectation of the Church's emerging from its state of sin and misery, into a better condition. Such were the arguments which this wise and good man chose. I may truly say of him, what one of the ancients says of Socrates, that he did not apply himself to trifling and less useless things; "he promoted that knowledge which was like to have the greatest efficacy upon men."

He managed his arguments with great judgment and charity: he spake the truth in love. He did not contend for victory, but truth. His writings speak a right Christian temper all along. The instruments he used served to cultivate and improve, and to pare away what was superfluous, and what was hurtful: he had no skill to hurt and destroy in the mountain of the Lord.

His great knowledge did not puff him up; his charity and humility, and modesty, held proportion to it. He was far removed from a high conceit of himself, or contempt of others; he was far from being pert and talkative, far from ostentation and show, from insulting over his adversary, or vaunting of his victories.

With respect to his neighbour, he may be truly said to have

\* His works, practical and controversial, were collected and published in one volume folio, in 1707, and they fully merit the encomium bestowed upon them by the learned prelate who preached the funeral sermon of Mr. Allen.

been a righteous man in the most comprehensive sense of that word. He was exactly just to all men in his dealings and trade; of this there is no question: and those who knew him well, can tell that in making up his accounts, he was scrupulously so, and took great care that an error or mistake in his correspondent should not be to his prejudice. He was greatly careful to do no wrong, and had learnt to forgive. I doubt not but the character given to Pomponius Atticus belongs to him; "He had no quarrels, for he did no injury; and if any were done to him, he rather chose to forget than to revenge." There are few men, perhaps, have passed through the world with less offence to it than this good man hath done. His ways pleased God, and he so provided, that his enemies (if he had any such) should be at peace with him.

But he did not only do no harm, but did much good in the world; he was not only just to all, but merciful to the afflicted, to the poor and needy: he had a great sense of the miseries of others: he was a most compassionate Christian: he did not love in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth. The love of God dwelt in him, and by this he was constrained, and could not shut up his bowels of compassion from his brother: he needed no motives or arguments, it was enough to name the objects: he stood ready always and prepared, and neither wanted ability or inclination to help the afflicted.

Indeed, this humble soul avoided the notice and the praise of men: he that in other things was open and free, studied concealment here: he gave generally with his own hands, and wisely disposed of his charity to those whom he thought the fittest objects; but yet for all his care and his art, he could not altogether be concealed. I have great reason to believe, from what I have the certain knowledge of, that he gave great sums and large proportions, and that both the prisoners and other distressed persons have lost one of their greatest friends, and for his proportion, one of their most generous benefactors. But since it was the pleasure of our dear brother to bestow in secret, out of respect and deference to his memory and inclination, I will not search after the particular instances of his bounty.

In a word, our dear brother was a great example to us of modesty and humility, of obedience to superiors, of diligence

in improving all the portions of his time, of fidelity and integrity, of kindness and great calmness and prudence, if we consider him as an husband, a father, a neighbour, or a friend. His latter end was like his former life ; it was even and undisturbed : he then showed his faith in God, and resignation to his will ; his concern for the Church, and his well grounded hope of eternal life. A little before his death he called for his family, and as became a dying Christian, and one that was sensible of his departure hence, he exhorted them especially to two things :

*First*, That they should preserve in their minds a lively sense, and make a thankful acknowledgment of the love of Christ, who for our sake was content to become a man, and to submit to death, even the death of the cross ; he required them to consider that this was for our sakes purely, and that Jesus could be induced by no interest to do this, but that which was peculiarly and solely ours.

*Secondly*, That they would be steady and constant in a course of piety and true religion, well knowing the hazards and temptations of this mortal life, and that we lose our labour if we do not persevere unto the end.

Having said these things, he prayed that God would send them an happy meeting in another and better world.

Having set his house in order, and disposed himself for another world, he gave up his spirit into the hands of his God, his merciful Creator, which (I make no doubt) is added to the spirits of just men made perfect.

Thus did our dear friend live in the world, and thus did he leave it ; he lived above it, and was prepared to leave it : he was one of the greatest patterns of the Christian life that this age hath produced, and did by his life prove the truth and practicableness of the Christian doctrine, and express the lustre and goodness of Christianity at the same time. In him we might see the loveliness of religion, and how well fitted it is to amend our own tempers, and to render us useful to the world.

In him we might behold great knowledge and the profoundest humility ; an ability to teach others, and the greatest docility or readiness to learn ; the courage and resolution of a confessor, and at the same time the humility of a child ; a great charity



without vaunting, a great zeal without faction, and a diligent pursuit of truth without dogmatizing, or study of parties.

In his converse with others he was grave, but not morose; very gentle and friendly, highly civil and obliging: his discourse was serious and heavenly, not frothy and trifling: he spake well of mankind, and was very prone to hope the best of all: he was not full of discourse, but it was always like the good man, modest and inoffensive, and such as ministered to edify or instruct.

He had a great sense of any evil that the Church of God felt, and perhaps few men that lived were more concerned than he for the sufferings of his fellow Christians; but still he was far from murmuring or diffidence, but had a steadfast faith in God's providence, and did greatly encourage others to hope in God: he well considered the usefulness of afflictions, and endeavoured to good purpose to awaken men to pray fervently for the Church of Christ, and to depend upon God for the fulfilling all those excellent promises which have not as yet received their accomplishment.

He was for a very considerable part of his life a man of trade and worldly business: God blessed his endeavours, and the good man ply'd his calling; but his great care was to labour for the bread that endureth: he was more careful to keep the world out of his heart, than to get it into his possession: he was not only just and charitable, when he trafficked and dealt in worldly things, but heavenly also: he did not relinquish the world, and then pretend to despise it: he overcame the world more generously; he kept in it, and was abstracted from it: he used it, but was as if he used it not: he was religious in his shop, heavenly-minded upon the exchange, innocent and undefiled in the press and crowd of crafty, designing and depraved men.

For some time before his death he left off trading, and gave himself to reading and devotion, to fervent prayers and meditations of heaven, and heavenly things, to works of piety and charity, and the close consideration of his state toward God; he wisely considered that it was fit there should be a considerable space of time allowed between the hurries of life and the great work of dying well: he knew when he had enough of the

world, and had learnt the true use of riches ; and now he dispensed to others what he had gained in his younger time ; and he took care to season what he left behind him, by alms and acts of mercy and relief.

In a word, he was a very eminent example of Christian virtues, greatly esteemed by all good and wise men who knew him, and mean only in his own eyes.

---

## RELIGIOUS MEDITATIONS.

(Continued from p. 44.)

### No. XX.

#### THE NOBLEMAN'S DAUGHTER RESTORED TO LIFE.

St. Luke viii. 41.—*And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at JESUS' feet, and besought him that he would come into his house: For he had one only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went, the people thronged him. There cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying to him, 'Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master.' But when JESUS heard it, he answered him, saying, 'Fear not: believe only, and she shall be made whole.' And when he came into the house, he suffered no man to go in, save Peter, and James, and John, and the father and the mother of the maiden. And all wept, and bewailed her: but he said, 'Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth.' And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead. And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, 'Maid, arise.' And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway: and he commanded to give her meat. And her parents were astonished: but he charged them that they should tell no man what was done.*

#### MEDITATION.

**I** HERE behold one, under the dominion of death, hearing and obeying the voice of the SON OF GOD. He saith, 'MAID,

ARISE;’ and the gates of death are opened, and give back their prey. So shall he call forth myriads of his Saints, who now seem mouldering in the dust.—The daughter of *Jairus* arose to a natural life; but we look for a better resurrection, when sin and sorrow shall be for ever done away. In this hope, let me restrain immoderate grief, when my pious friends are taken away. Even if my child is stretched on the bed of death, may I have faith in CHRIST, and, governing myself by his precepts, let me in submissive resignation wait the issues of his Providence and Grace! He in true wisdom knows how, as in the instance which I am contemplating, to overrule the calamity of a family for the good of their souls; and to *strengthen their faith by those trials*, which, to human observation, might seem most likely to overthrow it.

## No. XXI.

## THE PRODIGAL SON.

St. Luke xv. 17.—*And, when he came to himself, he said, ‘How many hired servants of my father’s have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants.’ And he arose and came to his father. But, when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, ‘Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.’ But the father said to his servants, ‘Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat and be merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.’*

## MEDITATION.

WHEN this repentant Prodigal had only *begun* to return to his father, while *he was yet afar off*, his father saw him, and had compassion on him. So will MY HEAVENLY FATHER do to



me, and to every humble penitent, who with a true heart turneth unto him. His mercy will view him *while yet afar off*; he will have pity on him; he will meet him with his grace and favour; he will array him with the robe of a REDEEMER'S righteousness; and will invest him with the glorious privileges of a SON, who had been lost, and was found.

Our SAVIOUR hath declared—‘There is joy, in the presence of the Angels of God, over *one sinner* that repenteth.’ Oh may I, and every other penitent, be touched with a fervent desire, to become the joy of heaven, *by a sincere conversion*. So may I, and so may every such penitent share hereafter in that higher joy, which Angels and glorified Saints feel, when they see the slaves of sin restored to the paths of virtue, piety, and religion; to those paths which shall lead the humble and sincere Christian, with unfailing certainty, to the abodes of eternal glory and happiness.

No. XXII.

THE UNMERCIFUL SERVANT.

St. Mat. xviii. 27.—*Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants which owed him an hundred pence: and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, ‘Pay me that thou owest.’ And his fellow-servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, ‘Have patience with me and I will pay thee all.’ And he would not; but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, ‘O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me; shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow-servant, even as I had pity on thee?’ And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall MY HEAVENLY FATHER do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.*

## MEDITATION.

SHALL I bear malice to another, who hope after a few short years to be united in the presence of God with all those that fear him, and to live for ever in peace, in joy, and everlasting love? O no! far be it from *me*. May I ever bear in mind in how short a time I shall be a suppliant for *mercy* and *pardon* at the Judgment Seat of God; when all my secret sins shall be disclosed and brought to light: let me imagine myself thus humbled and exposed; trembling under the hand of God; casting myself on his compassion; and crying out for mercy. With these considerations impressed on my mind, can I be extreme to mark what is done amiss in my brother?—for we are all brethren:—can I refuse to be entreated, and disdain to forgive? Oh! may the God of MERCY preserve me from such impious and unnatural arrogance!—If I have been injured, let me bear in mind, how greatly I have offended against MY HEAVENLY FATHER; and may I remember that ‘Charity suffereth long, and is not easily provoked.’ May I therefore be slow to anger, and put on bowels of *mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearance, and forgiveness*;\* knowing that if I forgive men their trespasses, MY HEAVENLY FATHER will also forgive me:—But if I forgive not men their trespasses, neither will MY HEAVENLY FATHER forgive my trespasses.†

## No. XXIII.

## THE DANGER OF RICHES.

St. Luke vi. 20.—*And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, ‘Blessed be ye poor! for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh.—But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers*

\* Col. iii. 12, 13.

† Matt. vi. 14, 18.

*to the false prophets. But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you; bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. And AS YE WOULD THAT MEN SHOULD DO TO YOU, DO YE ALSO TO THEM LIKEWISE.'*

MEDITATION.

OUR LORD here pronounces the poor and the hungry, the mournful and the persecuted, happy;—and that they are miserable, who are rich, and full, and gay, and applauded. By this we are to understand, not that the rich and great must always be accounted wretched, or that the poor can ever possibly be happy, if they are vicious, or wasteful, or idle.—We are here taught that *prosperity is, in general, a state of danger*, and that an humble station is more safe and secure: for those who have received much, will have much to answer for; and the rich and the great will therefore have a dreadful account to make up at the last day, if they neglect to apply, in a proper manner, the talents which their Maker has given them. Riches are very deceitful, and it will be hard for those *who trust in them* to enter into THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.—Let these considerations therefore reconcile me to adversity, having regard not only to my SAVIOUR's precepts, but to his example; for he was poor and lowly of heart, and had not where to lay his head. May I also imitate HIM in bearing and forgiving injuries, and may I inscribe in my heart *his divine precept*—that, as I would that men should do to me, so will I do to them likewise.

No. XXIV.

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

St. Mat. xxv. 31.—*When the SON OF MAN shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.—And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the KING say unto them on his right hand, 'Come, ye blessed*



of my FATHER! inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.—For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me.’ Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, ‘LORD, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee?’—And the KING shall answer and say unto them, ‘Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.’

## MEDITATION.

OUR LORD addressed these words, not to the RICH only, but also to the POOR. The charity of *one farthing*, from the poor widow,\* was more acceptable than the costly gifts of all the wealthy.—Who did ever possess so little of this world’s goods, and yet who hath ever done so great and such extensive good, as our SAVIOUR and his *Apostles*? Our blessed LORD had not where to lay his head. *St. Peter* said, ‘Silver or gold have I none.’ *St. Paul* maintained himself by working with his hands. I may not indeed be able to perform miracles, to give food to the hungry, drink to the thirsty, habitation to the stranger, clothing to the naked, health to the sick, or freedom to those that are in bondage. But, still, however poor and humble my condition may be, *I may do much*.—I cannot restore the blind to sight; but, by kindness, I may be *eyes to the blind*.—I cannot heal the sick; but I can speak comfort to him, and I can lessen his sufferings.—If nothing else remains, I can give him my *prayers*. The prayer of *faith* may heal the sick, when all the skill of the physician hath failed.—I may train up my own children in the way of godliness; I may teach them, both by advice and example, to be industrious and content; and I shall then give them the best and the only valuable riches.—I may recal the unhappy wanderer from the error of his way. I may speak to him of the MERCY of his GOD; and tell him of a LOV-

\* Mark xii. 41.

ING SAVIOUR, who died for him, and for us all. I may induce him to throw himself at the feet of his offended CREATOR; I may persuade him humbly to beg that mercy, which *never was refused* to a true penitent. If I thereby save ONE IMMORTAL SOUL, I shall have done more good than those, *whose wealth hath kept thousands from perishing with hunger*. I may then be told by a merciful SAVIOUR, at the last day, that, forasmuch as I have done this to the least of one of these my brethren, *I have done it unto him*; and that therefore I shall inherit the KINGDOM prepared for me from the foundation of the world.

No. XXV.

THE LOVE OF GOD.

St. John iii. 12.—*‘If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even THE SON OF MAN, which is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must THE SON OF MAN be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have eternal life. For GOD so loved the world, that he gave HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For GOD sent not his SON into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.*

MEDITATION.

THESE words present unto me my REDEEMER, and him crucified. They display to me the treasures of divine love and beneficence, and show me the FATHER OF MERCIES, so compassionate to a sinful world, as to give HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON as a ransom for it. They manifest his descent from heaven, and his union with human nature, in order to instruct me in the things of GOD, and to prepare and fit me for eternal glory and happiness.—He came into the world, to be lifted up upon the cross;—he suffered a most painful and ignominious death;—that I and all might be saved from our sins, and might obtain everlasting life and happiness.—Oh! may I profit

by his mercy ! and may I direct my mind to MY REDEEMER ON THE CROSS ; trusting that I shall not perish but have everlasting life, if, in *faith and penitence*, I do address my soul to him, and show the sincerity of that faith and penitence, by being in *love and charity* with all men.—If GOD so loved me, how ought I to testify *my love* to GOD, by love and kindness to my fellow creatures? While I feel it to be my duty to ‘love GOD with all my heart, and with all my mind, with all my soul, and with all my strength ;’ let me not forget, that ‘he who loveth GOD, loveth his brother also ;’ and that I can have no hope that I am *really* showing my gratitude to GOD for all his benefits *by fervently loving him*,—if I do not live in obedience to his great command, AND LOVE MY BROTHER ALSO.

(*To be continued.*)

[*We invite the attention of our readers to the following treatise. It relates to some religious topics that are frequently, and with interest, discussed among Christians. Mr. Knox, the author, was a Presbyterian Minister, and resided for several years in this country, but afterwards removed to the West-Indies, and died on the island of St. Croix. In the following republication of his letter, the introduction, and some other sentences are omitted which were not essential to the argument ; and a note to the introduction is incorporated with the letter.*]

*A Letter to the Rev. Mr. JACOB GREEN, of New-Jersey, pointing out some Difficulties in the Calvinistic Scheme of Divinity, respecting FREE WILL, DIVINE DECREES, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, &c. and requesting a Solution of them. By HUGH KNOX, Minister of the Gospel in the Island of Saba, in the West-Indies.*

[Continued from vol. v. p. 448.]

**BUT** you disclaim the doctrine of *particular redemption*, and therefore are not chargeable with its consequences. Let us examine however whether you do not confound the ideas of *natural* and *moral inability* in your sermon, and whether *moral inability*, in some passages of it, does not, by fair construction,



amount to that which is *properly natural*. Indeed, I cannot see it possible for any person of your principles to avoid confusion in this matter; because I think some of your principles utterly inconsistent with this distinction.

You in a manner begin your discourse with a *postulatum* which seems to need proof, by saying, page 4th, "That God might justly have left all mankind in their obstinacy and impenitency, without affording his *special*, or even *restraining* grace."—Yes, provided these were *self-contracted*, and arose not from original corruption, aided by a fatal train of invincible motives to evil, inducing necessity; in which case, I should imagine that the obstinacy and impenitency of mankind would have been blameless and guiltless. God might doubtless have justly extinguished the human race as soon as it fell, punishing only the *actually* guilty; but having spared it, and suffered it to propagate upon the earth, the question is, Whether he might have, consistent with his *justice* and *benevolence*, left it in a state of sin and misery, without affording it a dispensation of either *special* or *restraining* grace?—He *did not*, and therefore I argue that he *could not*; for he did what was *best*, and *could not* do otherwise. But these bold hypothetical *postulata* seem to be the natural offspring of a system which begins with the consideration of man in a fallen state, and passes slightly over the grand question, "How mankind came into those circumstances of sin and misery in which we now find them?" From an attentive consideration of which question, I imagine, the *necessity of a dispensation of mercy*, on God's part, will clearly appear; and that this mercy cannot be the *narrow, contracted partial* thing which particular redemptionists suppose, but must reach, in the possible attainment of it, to all the kind.

You assert, page 18 of the sermon, "The want of power," or *spiritual inability*, "is the want of will." "This want of will is all the inability there is. What God requires is the soul and will, in that which is spiritually good. Man lost his spiritual ability, or good will, or inclination to good, by the depravity of human nature, at the fall," p. 14. Then God requires that which man hath not to give him, and never had since the fall: for "the sinner's *inability* is the same as the *depravity of nature*;" and "till God, by his omnipotent power, changes the heart and will," and puts the sinner within the reach of good motives,

"he never will cease to love sin, and have an aversion to holiness." p. 20. It is a *good* heart and will that God requires of the sinner, which the sinner has not to give, and which he cannot have, until God gives it him. "If then a sinner *cannot* will a thing until he *hath willed* it; nor choose until he *hath chosen*; nor desire, until he *hath desired*;"\* and that some power that he *hath not*, must first enable him to *will*, *choose* and *desire*, before he *can* do these things:—what can this be but a *natural inability*? It is the *want* of an ability which he hath never divested himself of, because he never possessed it: in short, it is such an inability as *frees him from blame*, (by page 12); because, to the giving of God the will he is supposed to demand, there is an "insuperable difficulty;" in as much as the man cannot give *what he has never had*, nor ever can obtain by any endeavours of his own: nay, the man cannot even *desire* it, or *wish* for it. "He *can* desire, when he *hath a desire*," but not before. Yet you say, (p. 19.) "they have all the power that can be conceived in the nature of things for a sinner to have;—for they have light in the understanding; they see the reasonableness and fitness of things, and the obligations they are under," &c. I greatly question this. I always thought the *understanding* was sadly darkened and blinded by the fall;—that the *natural man could not know, nor discern the things of the spirit of God*,—and that it required the power of renewing grace to cure *this faculty* of its blindness; *that, the eyes of their understanding being enlightened, sinners might know what is the hope of his calling*, &c. But I find that Mr. Hopkins and you make out this faculty pretty sound and vigorous, as though it had suffered *little*, if *any* thing, by the original apostacy.

You assert, page 26th, "It is impossible to choose a new heart, without having a new heart."—Yet below—"God requires the *inclination, choice, and will* to that which is good;" and God must give this *new heart* before the sinner can *will*

\* This is a strange paradox founded upon Mr. EDWARDS's subtle doctrine of the will: Whereas surely we can conceive of a power inherent in an intelligent agent (such as the human soul) prior to its operation or exertion. May not a soul have a *power* of willing before it *wills*? May not I have a will to do something, before I exert this volition, so as to bring this thing into existence?

or even *desire* it. God then requires a *natural impossibility* from the sinner.

In the whole of the second branch (p. 29) you include *natural invincible* propensities in the notion of *spiritual inability*, and make no difference, in point of blameableness, between *them* and *such* as are contracted by *habit* and *indulgence*. You seem indeed to have been aware (p. 24) that there is some difference, as to *blame*, between propensities *born with us*, and those contracted “by custom and practice;” by keeping the *former* out of sight, while you argue the sinner’s faultiness. But *here*, where you purpose to remove this weighty objection against blame, you seem very superficial; alleging, in general, that to plead any *abatement of blame* from original corruption, is, in fact, to cast the charge of it upon God, instead of *blaming* and *condemning* ourselves for *original sin* :\* and then recurring to your definition of faultiness, you put off the matter lightly on which the greatest stress lies, by saying, “that this is the view of awakened convinced sinners.”† I am of opinion that it is a sinner’s *own* guiltiness,

\* I would beg leave to put some questions here, to which I would beg *direct* and *categorical* answers. Do you think it possible for a man, judging rightly, to *blame* and *condemn* himself, as guilty of *Adam’s first sin*? Do you think we are *properly* to blame for the corrupt natures we brought into the world with us, antecedently to our approbation of them, and acting in conformity to them? Or that God ever *did* or *will* condemn a human creature to *eternal misery*, *purely* for this corruption of nature? Or, that he *may* do it consistent with infinite justice and benevolence?—If not; can I have *proper remorse* for that, as my *sin*, which God *will* not, *cannot* impute to me as my *sin*, and for which he *will* not, *cannot* punish me *eternally*? Can I therefore *blame* and *condemn* myself for *original sin*?

† We are not, I apprehend, in this controversy, to consider the *feelings* of *awakened convinced sinners*, relative to their original corruption. The very youngest of them have *actual sin* enough to make them most humble, and to make them feel infinitely *guilty* and *unworthy* before God. Besides the new views they have of the great corruption of their nature; its infinite opposition to God’s holiness, and the necessity of its being removed, before they can enjoy God, the chief good, must needs fill them with *vast concern* (if not remorse) on this head. And these different feelings rising so powerfully and instantaneously in the mind, cannot well be distinguished at that time. When a man *feels himself drowning*, he has no leisure to consider *how* he got into the water; but, perceiving himself in a perishing condition, *eagerly* catches at the hand of a deliverer, anxious to get out of imminent danger. But when, as *divines* or *philosophers*, we coolly and deliberately trace things to their source and origin, we are directly led to consider *how* men came into their present *wretched, helpless* condition, and to vindicate the dealings of God with them in *this state*. And this I take to be the proper business of the present controversy.



and *self-contracted* vileness and pollution which *most* distress him at that time. "*The soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" *Original sin*, or, what I would rather choose to term it, *original corruption* (for I know of no original sin, properly so called, but the first transgression of *Adam*), is only of *secondary* consideration, as the source from which actual transgressions flow, and the stock on which they are ingrafted by our own hands, and it therefore ought to be *lamented*, and must be *removed*, in order to the attainment of true holiness.

You say, page 33, "We may hence infer the importance of ministers taking pains to enlighten the people," &c. Page 20, you said that "sinners are so out of the way of rational motives, that God's omnipotent power is necessary," &c. And here the preacher is directed to *enlighten* and *offer motives*, as a very important duty, and the *success* not in the least doubted.

Page 35 you assert, "If they saw their *helplessness* was nothing but their *wickedness* (and this they *may* see, or rather *do* see already, without any supernatural means; for there is light in the understanding, &c. p. 19, 20, 25) instead of pretending to wait for God's help (as some presumptuously do), they *might* immediately submit to God."—*Might* they indeed? This seems to imply some *power to change the will* not granted before, and which indeed I, even upon *my* principles, would not choose to grant: for it is my firm persuasion that the *corrupt human will* will never be changed to any degree of good, without a *supernatural, divine* influence.

Now, when the above things are attentively considered, which seem perfectly of a piece with President *Edwards's* reasoning on the same subject (see his *book on the will*, from p. 22 to p. 26, &c.) and when, to these, is added his doctrine of *external motives*; I think it must evidently appear that your *natural* and *spiritual inability* come at last to the *very same thing*.

Next as to your doctrine of *praise* and *blame*, you say (p. 13) "that, in order to know whether a person is to blame, mankind do not enter into the abstruse inquiry, *whether he could help being of such a bad inclination and will, or how he came by it?*" But, *my dear Sir*, this is the very *abstruse inquiry* which is *necessary* to be made, in order to justify the ways of God to *man*: for, if he "could not help being of such a bad inclination and will," nor ever had it in his power to help it;

but came by this perverse temper, not through any fault of his own; you may indeed call his temper *perverse* or *faulty*,—but I should deem him as *blameless* in being of such a temper, as a heavy body is, in having an invincible tendency and inclination towards the centre of gravity.\* “They reasonably conclude,” you say, “that such a perverse temper and practice is *faulty*,”—I suppose you mean *criminal*, and *justly punishable*, in the person that has it. “They know that if the person had a *desire*, *heart* or *will* to do otherwise, he could do otherwise; there is no impediment,” (what? if he cannot help being of such a temper? if he has no *heart*, *desire* or *will* to do otherwise; nor can have it?) “and, therefore, he is to blame.” I think *not guilty*, if the case be indeed so. A child is prick’d by a pin—it winches, cries, and will not be quiet—the nurse pronounces it stubborn—its temper is *perverse* and *bad*—but when she *inquires* into, and *knows* the cause, she cannot *in justice* pronounce it *criminal*, and *deserving of punishment*. The other instances seem not much to the purpose; because they are all those of *adults*, who may be supposed to have added to original corruption, inveterate habits of vice, by a wilful indulgence; and are, therefore, highly criminal, and justly punishable.

Your definition of *blameableness* (p. 12), where you conclude a person *blameable*, and, consequently, *punishable*, “who has

\* The distinction which Mr. Knox makes between the *perverseness* or *faultiness* of a certain temper of mind, and the *blameableness* of the individual who possesses this temper, is just and important. This temper may be in itself *faulty* or *perverse*; but if the individual possesses it through *no act of his own*, he is *not to blame* for it. Guilt is contracted and punishment incurred, only by the commission of *actual sin*. On this subject the 9th article of the Church displays that *caution* and *moderation* which distinguish all the articles. This article pronounces concerning “original sin,” styled “the fault or corruption of our nature,” that “it *deserveth* God’s wrath and damnation.” Sin in *itself* is certainly obnoxious to God’s wrath. But if any of his creatures are sinful through *no act* of their own, they cannot be blameable, they cannot be justly obnoxious to punishment. Man, therefore, is not more *blameable* for his original corruption which he inherits, than he is for any bodily infirmity with which he comes into the world. He is *blameable* only for those actual transgressions which through divine grace it is in his power to avoid. Accordingly, the 9th article does not maintain the Calvinistic doctrine equally abhorrent to reason and scripture, that all men are justly obnoxious to eternal misery for Adam’s sin!! Original sin, the corruption of human nature may deserve God’s wrath; and yet they who are tainted with this corruption, through no act of their own, be in no respect liable on account of it, to eternal punishment. His actual transgressions, only committed with the choice of his will made free by grace, expose him to this awful doom. *Ed.*

no desire, inclination, will, or endeavour to that which is *reasonable, fit, and proper* to be done; which is attended with good consequences when done, and to the doing of which there is no insuperable difficulty;" seems pretty unexceptionable; but there seems to be little regard paid to the last clause of it throughout the rest of the discourse. Certainly a person who has sufficient light and knowledge of duty, and of his obligations to perform it, and of the fitness and reasonableness of it, and to the performance of which there is *no insuperable difficulty*, and yet has neither *desire, will, nor endeavour* towards the performance of it, is *justly blameable* before God and man; and *all such*, I believe, without timely repentance, will *bear their iniquity*. The latter branch of the same definition (p. 13) seems to me *defective*; nor could I admit it without a *proviso* which I shall subjoin to it in *italicks*. It runs thus: "When a person has a desire, inclination, heart, and endeavour for that which is unreasonable, unfit, and improper to be done; which he is commanded by God not to do, and the doing of which will be pernicious to himself and others; then he is to blame." *Provided, nevertheless, add I, that the person be a free agent; hath the liberty of choice, and is under no necessitating influence of doing what he does, nor natural inability of doing the contrary.* But the grand difficulty with me, is, how to reconcile, that *fatal train or chain of causal motives*, by which men are necessarily determined in all their *volitions and actions*, both good and evil; in so much that they *cannot will or do* otherwise than they actually *will and do* (which I take to be precisely President Edwards's scheme); with the *free agency* of the creature, and his rewardableness and punishableness; or with the *justice and essential universal benevolence* of the divine Being. *Hic labor, hoc opus est!*

The distinction "that men *can* do otherwise, if they had a heart and will to it," appears to me either *extremely trifling*, or *subtle and abstruse* beyond my comprehension: for the scheme against which I militate expressly supposes that the *will itself* (including, I suppose, *heart, desire, and inclination*) is necessarily *moved and impelled* by external motives; *which*, to suppose that it *could resist*, would be to give up the controversy; and to allow the *self-determining* power of the will. So that if this necessary determination of the *will itself* by exter-



nal motives which it cannot counteract, control, or resist, does not so far destroy *free agency*, as to render the creature *thus* influenced and moved, incapable of *praise* or *blame*, and leave the wicked under a *natural inability* of becoming good, by any means or endeavours within the compass of their own power; I confess I shall for ever despair of being able to draw a certain conclusion from the clearest premises.

I conceive that the liberty of different beings may be *widely*, yea, *essentially* different; and that if we argue from *liberty of will* in GOD, CHRIST, *angels*, and *perfected human spirits*, to liberty of will in *man* in present circumstances, we shall be in danger of falling into very great mistakes. Yet *this*, President *Edwards* and you have both done; and the main stress of your scheme seems to lie upon the inferences from this kind of reasoning. You argue that *virtue* in GOD is *necessary* in the highest degree, and yet he is in the highest degree praise-worthy:—That, on the other hand, vice is necessary in the highest degree in the *devil* and other damned spirits, who are yet in the highest degree *blameable* and *punishable*.

When you consider *Adam* as breaking the covenant, and abusing a glorious liberty, you cannot help considering him as *more blameable* and *guilty* than a child born of sinful parents in a state of corruption; or even than a common adult transgressor at this day. And when you consider the *angels* as falling from their first state of holiness, without a tempter, you are inclinable to consider them as *more blameable* than *Adam*, as having abused higher privileges, and a more glorious liberty than his. *Angels* and perfected human spirits who are fixed and confirmed in happiness and holiness, have certainly a more perfect freedom of will to good, than is agreeable to *creatures* in a state of trial; i. e. *liberty of will* is a *greater perfection* in *those* than in *these*. It will be easily allowed also that there are many different degrees of this freedom of the will towards good among Christians, even in this present life, from the *new convert*, the *babe* in CHRIST, the Christian of *imperfect character* and *low attainments*, to the *most confirmed Christians* and *eminent saints*; all these degrees progressively tending nearer and nearer to the glorious liberty of perfected spirits. That virtue is necessary in God, and yet highly *praise-worthy*, I am far from denying. But, that liberty or freedom of will in God an indefect-

ible being, and in *man* a lapsed creature in a state of probation, is *essentially* or *specifically* the same kind of perfection, is not at all evident, but rather the contrary. GOD is *impeccable* and *indefectible*, not from any *fatal* or *physical necessity*, not by any motives from without, or by any decrees, commands, promises or threatenings from the will or power of a superior being; but by the infinite wisdom, purity, rectitude and perfection of his own nature, which invariably determines him to will and choose that which is fittest and best. So that it may be said in one sense, that GOD is virtuous by *necessity of nature*, and that he *cannot* be otherwise; yet this arises from no *deficiency of power* in the ALMIGHTY, but from the *singular* and *peerless* perfection of his *understanding*, which ever *discerns* that which is good, and rectitude of his *will* which ever *chooses* and *approves* it. Is not moral liberty, therefore, something *singular* in GOD, and *essentially* different from what it *is*, or *can* be, in any creature? None sure is *good*, in this sense, but GOD; the very heavens are not pure in his sight, and he *chargeth his angels with folly*. If elect angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, are now *impeccable* and *infallible*, and their wills have an invincible tendency to good, they are not so in *their own nature*; they owe this *perfection of liberty* wholly to GOD, and depend on influences, motives, and considerations *without them* for the continuance of it; it is an *adventitious perfection* conferred upon, and continued with them to complete their felicity. I would, therefore, beg leave to suppose that the *praise* due to GOD is quite of a different nature and consideration from that due to an imperfect creature, who, in a state of probation, acquits itself well. GOD is infinitely holy by necessity of nature, and is therefore infinitely to be praised, loved, and admired for this glorious, incommunicable perfection;—to be praised, not because he *does not* act unworthily, but because he is so perfect that he *cannot*.

But when we consider that imperfect kind of liberty, which seems peculiar to creatures in a state of probation, and without which it seems impossible that they should be probationers at all, *praise* and *blame* as applicable to them, seem to be different, and to take their rise from a different source. *Praise*, in my opinion, implies that a man *might* have done *worse*; and *blame*, that he *might* have done *better*. *Blame*, even in *devils*, seems

to imply that they have contracted their present inveterate, incurable wickedness, by some *personal fault, neglect, or abuse* of theirs, which they might have either *prevented or remedied*. And *blame* in damned human spirits, I am persuaded, is to be grounded on the same reason. For my part, I should think it altogether as just to blame a man for being *born blind*, as a child for being *born with a corrupt nature*; and therefore think it as certain that no infant shall ever be everlastingly punished *purely* for original corruption, as that there is a *just and righteous* God. And could I be certain that any human creature was born with such a nature, and placed by an overruling providence in such circumstances of life, as that he could by *no means within his power* obtain reformation; let him be as wicked and mischievous as he would, I should deem him no more *blame-worthy* or *punishable* for being so, than a stone for falling, or water for spreading itself into an horizontal plane. On the other hand, could I conceive an *angel* in a confirmed state of holiness, without any antecedent trial of virtue, I would call such an angel a *holy and happy* creature; but could by no means suppose its holiness a *praise-worthy qualification*. The *praise* would be due *only*, and *wholly* to him who made it so.

But the grand argument, “that praise is due to *necessary virtue* even in a *creature*, and that too in a *state of trial*,” upon which President *Edwards* lays the greatest stress, and which he thinks is decisive in the controversy, is taken from the *human soul of the man Jesus*, all the acts of whose will are supposed to be *necessarily holy*, and yet at the same time truly *virtuous, praise-worthy* and *rewardable*. Mr. *Edwards* has taken uncommon pains to prove the *first part* of this position; because, he says, it has been denied by *Episcopius* and other *Arminians*. I confess I can see little weight in what Mr. *Edwards* has said so largely on this head, with regard to the solution of the main difficulty. No Christian I suppose will dispute that there was an *eventual consequential necessity* of the *perfect holiness* of the man *Jesus* (as the Calvinists allow there is of the *sincere holiness* and *final salvation* of elect sinners). The will of the man *Jesus* was invariably determined to good by proper motives suited to his rational nature, and in consequence of the divine *fore-knowledge, decree, covenant, promises*, and the *succours and supports* promised and given unto him; that is,



it was *impossible* for him to commit sin, in the same sense as it is *impossible* for an elect sinner to be damned;—or it was as *necessary* for him to continue perfectly holy, as it is for an elect sinner to become sincerely holy by conversion, and to be finally saved. Yet who will say that either of these are *necessarily* *holy* and virtuous, in the same sense or manner that GOD is so? GOD is *indefectible* and *impeccable* in himself: but will any say that the *human soul* of CHRIST, as a creature, is *thus* necessarily holy; or that it was in the same manner impossible for it to sin? Nay, the very supposition, that it was properly in a state of trial, seems to imply that it was not *impossible in the nature of things* for it to fall. Herein, I think, evidently consists one part of the preeminence of the *second Adam* above the *first*. The one abused a glorious liberty; the other *did not*, although he *might*. We might have thought it impossible for mere man to have preserved this virtue and integrity in such a world and state as this, because *Adam* did not: But GOD hath graciously condescended to convince us of the contrary, by exhibiting an instance of the *possibility* of it in the *man Jesus*; who, although a mere man, and tempted in all points as *Adam* was, and we are, yet continued perfectly *sinless* and *heroically virtuous*;—of which the holy life of CHRIST could have been no proper instance, could we suppose his soul properly *impeccable*. If we suppose the soul of CHRIST *indefectible*, then all his trials and temptations will seem to lose their significancy and propriety: For to what purpose tempt an impeccable being? No supposeable force of temptation can be any trial at all to the virtue of a being wholly *indefectible*. How could such a being *suffer*, *being tempted*; or learn from an experience of the *force* and *weight* of temptations, to *pity*, *sympathize with*, and *succour* those that are tempted? It adds little honour, in my opinion, to the moral character of the man Jesus, to say that he vanquished temptations which could cost him no manner of conflict or struggle; that he passed through a state of probation, without meeting one adequate trial of his virtue; and that he merited exaltation and glory by conquering temptations, under which it was impossible for him to have succumbed. CHRIST, therefore, as a man, is to be *praised* and for ever *admired* by all the rational world, for gloriously acquitting himself in a state of trial; for obeying the divine commands, and

being encouraged by the divine promises, and thus continuing in a steady, exalted course of virtue amidst the strongest temptations and trials; while it was *possible* for him, in the nature of things, to have done *otherwise*. Nor do I think that this supposition does at all derogate from the glory of the man *Jesus*; but greatly inhances it; seeing it supposes him to have so gloriously improved an *imperfect liberty*, peculiar to creatures in a state of trial. On the contrary; to suppose his human soul indefectible, is to make it equal with God.

I also think there is a fallacy in your borrowing your idea of blame-worthiness, from what is so estimated among men, especially upon your principles, as you do, *pages 13 and 14* of your discourse. If I mistake not, the common sense of mankind runs directly counter to your idea of it. If vile transgressors, thieves, robbers, murderers, &c. are deemed culpable and punishable by human society, it is upon *my principles*; upon the prevailing supposition that they *might* have acted *better*, if they had so pleased;—and not only so, but that they *might* have *willed* and *inclined* better. Their having it in their power to choose a better course, while they neglect this choice, is the very thing which renders them *blame-worthy* in the esteem of human society; and destroys that pity in the minds of men, to which they could be otherwise entitled. Although *madmen* and *lunatics* commit bad actions as much *with their will*, and as *freely*, in your sense of the word, as other men; yet because they are not *moral agents*, in my sense of moral agency, the *blameableness* of such actions in them, is extenuated in exact proportion to the degree of their *madness*. But were it the general, prevailing sense of mankind, that wicked men were under the influence of motives which they could not resist, and that, in the plan and disposal of providence, it was necessary for them to act just as they do act, we might *pity* them, but sure we could not *blame* them: nay, human society might find it necessary to confine them, as men do *bears* and *lions*, to prevent their doing mischief; or even, in some cases, to cut them off for the benefit and security of others, as we kill a *viper* lest he bite us; but how could we deem them blameable before God, or punishable in a future state, for a conduct to which they were impelled by a *fatal* necessity of nature?

(*To be continued.*)

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*The EVIDENCES of the RESURRECTION of CHRIST briefly stated.  
An EASTER Meditation.*

WITH the resurrection of Jesus Christ stand or fall all those exalted blessings which are offered to mankind in his gospel. If Christ be risen from the dead, then have we the joyful assurance, that "God hath highly exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins." He is then become "the first fruits of them that sleep:" and he who "raised up Jesus from the dead will also quicken our mortal bodies." Christ, by his resurrection, was "declared to be the Son of God;" and "whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but shall have everlasting life."

That our faith, therefore, in this glorious truth, which is the foundation of all our hopes, may be enlightened and firm, it will be proper to consider the evidences which establish it.

The resurrection of Christ was attested by a sufficient number of witnesses, who were competent judges of the fact—their character and situation rendered them worthy of credit—they maintained their testimony in opposition to their own worldly interest, through suffering, persecution, and finally death itself—and they sealed their testimony by the exercise of supernatural powers, by which they established the religion of their Saviour throughout the world. There can be no stronger proofs of any fact, than that it is asserted by a sufficient number of credible witnesses, who have no interest in deceiving; who maintain it with the sacrifice of every thing that could be a motive to deception; and who attest it by such miraculous powers as prove they have the sanction and support of God himself.

The resurrection of Christ was attested by a sufficient number of witnesses, who were competent judges of the fact.

Christ appeared, not only to one of his disciples, but to them all, at various times and places. He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; and afterwards, from the midst of his Apostles, he was taken up into heaven. The witnesses of the resurrection were therefore sufficiently numerous; and



they were proper judges of the fact. They had been the companions of their Lord. They were intimately acquainted with his person, and therefore could not be deceived when he appeared to them again. So far were they from being predisposed to believe in his resurrection, that it was indeed an event which they never expected; and of which they had formed no just notion. The numerous predictions, and the express declarations of our Lord himself, that he should rise again from the dead, could not vanquish their blindness and incredulity. Christ, after his resurrection, appeared to two of them going to Emmaus, walked with them, and conversed with them even of his own character and life; and yet so little idea had they of his resurrection, that they did not recognize him. When he appeared afterwards to the eleven, their incredulity and fears still concealed the person of their Lord! There is here no appearance of a weak credulity that could be blinded or deceived. There is here no evidence of the operation of an ardent enthusiasm, of a fond hope that their Master would rise again, which would induce the Apostles eagerly to catch even at the most faint evidence of the truth of the event. Their incredulity rendered them more proper judges of the truth of the resurrection. For this incredulity excited suspicion; it led to examination; it could not be vanquished but by repeated, strong, and irresistible proofs. The Apostles did not recognize their Lord, till he had appeared to them at various times, conversed with them, sat down with them at table, had eaten with them, and had offered them his hands and feet to handle. The criminal doubt of the unbelieving Thomas strengthens our faith; for he was not convinced but by the pathetic and penetrating call of his Saviour, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and put it into my side, and be not faithless but believing." The witnesses of Christ's resurrection were therefore proper judges of the fact.

Their character and situation rendered them worthy of credit.

It is in the highest degree improbable, that simple, ignorant fishermen could forge the strange and unnatural story of their Master's resurrection. It is absurd to suppose that these despised refuse of the people would conceive the bold and hazardous plan of attacking the institutions of their forefathers, and the

religion of the Gentile world, by asserting the false story, that their Master, who had been crucified and committed to the sepulchre, had risen from the dead. His body, which was guarded in the sepulchre by his implacable enemies, would have been immediately produced, and confounded their plans. They were ignorant and despised; incapable of contriving, destitute of the means of supporting a forgery. Look at the histories which they have written. What a testimony do they afford of the simplicity, sincerity, modesty, and candour of their writers? With what faithfulness do they record their faults; their unbelief, their prejudices, their ambition, their contentions, their base forsaking and denying of their Master? Is this simplicity and honesty consistent with the intrigue and cunning necessary to ensure success to impostors? Is it characteristic of impostors to expose their faults, to hand down the stains of their characters; and thus to court reprehension and censure? But the truth of the resurrection rests not merely on the sincerity and honesty apparent in the witnesses of it.

Their testimony claims our belief, because they maintained it with the sacrifice of worldly interest, through suffering, persecution, and even death itself.

Fanatics and enthusiasts indeed, in the impulses of a furious zeal, have encountered the tortures of the rack, and embraced devouring flames, in support of the errors of a heated imagination. But there is the greatest difference between suffering in defence of an *opinion* which an inflamed and misguided imagination may ardently embrace, and encountering tortures and death in defence of a *fact*, in regard to which, being the object of their senses, men could not be deceived. Was there ever an instance of men, without any motive of ambition, of pride, or of gain, but, on the contrary, in opposition to all these, sustaining bitter sufferings, submitting to agonizing death, in testimony of a fact, which they knew to be false, and in maintaining which, therefore, they could not be supported by the fervors of a heated zeal, or the impulses of a misguided conscience? Common sense revolts at the supposition that the timid, doubting, unbelieving Apostles would attest the fact of their Master's resurrection, when they knew it to be false; that they would maintain their testimony through suffering and persecution, through perils and dangers, "through weariness and

painfulness, through hunger and thirst, through cold and nakedness;" that they would seal their testimony to an event, which they knew never happened, even in the agonies of an excruciating death; when, by renouncing the false assertion, they could secure wealth, prosperity, and honour? Heathen historians testify that the Apostles, and primitive disciples, did sustain the most excruciating sufferings, the most agonizing deaths, in attestation of the *fact* of their Lord's resurrection.

The chain of evidence that establishes our Saviour's resurrection, is fixed at the throne of God. His almighty arm and power were manifested in attestation of it. For the witnesses of the resurrection sealed their testimony by the exercise of supernatural powers; by which they established the religion of their Saviour throughout the world, in opposition to the pride, the prejudices, and passions of mankind.

God the eternal author of truth, cannot sanction imposture. It is impious in the extreme to suppose that he would have endowed the disciples with miraculous powers, to enable them to attest an event that never happened; and thus to impose on the world a gross and abominable falsehood. Even if we refuse to yield our assent to the miracles of Christ, (of which indeed there is the strongest testimony), on the ground that we are uncertain whether they were ever performed; we cannot reject a truth attested by the unanimous voice of history, that in the short space of thirty years, the disciples converted all the known nations of the world to the belief that Christ who had been crucified, had risen from the dead. The nations could not have been made thus to bow before the cross of one crucified as a malefactor, but by the arm and power of the Most High! The famous impostor of the East, indeed, was acknowledged by a large part of the world as the prophet of God. But what was the religion which he presented to the world—what the means by which he enforced it? His religion cherished the passions; courted a sensual imagination by the most luxurious and wanton enjoyments; offered a paradise, in which the disciples of the prophet should revel in sensual delights. To the success of such a religion, nothing more was necessary than to propose it to the corrupt and luxurious nations of the East. And those whom the charms of this sensual religion could not allure to the banner of the impostor, he subdued at the head of powerful



armies, by the terrors of desolation and the sword. Sensual pleasures and conquest were the weapons which established his religion. But look at the character of the disciples of Christ; look at the religion which they espoused. Its doctrines are humiliating to the pride and passions of human nature; its precepts are holy and spiritual. And could the disciples, simple, ignorant, despised fishermen, without learning, power, or respect, have established, by the mere force of ingenuity and cunning, a gospel that combated the inveterate prejudices of the Jews, the pride and vain learning of the philosophers, the idolatry, superstition and lust of the heathen world? Could these contemptible men by intrigue and art, have persuaded the Jews to renounce their law, in which they gloried; and to enlist under the banners of him whom they had crucified as a malefactor? Could they by their eloquence have persuaded the philosophers among the Gentiles, to embrace doctrines humiliating and disgusting to the pride of that human reason, in which they made their boast? Could the Apostles, destitute as they were of learning, of eloquence, or power, have rooted out the idolatry and superstition of the world; and induced men voluntarily to embrace a religion that condemned their passions, that forbade their sensual gratifications, that inculcated humility, self-denial, universal holiness of heart and life? No! the miracles by which the Apostles proved the divinity of their mission, the arm and power of the Most High God, exercised by them, established the religion of Jesus on the ruins of the kingdom of Satan and the world. And the truth which the Apostles attested by this supernatural agency is, that "Christ died for our sins, and *rose again* for our justification."

"Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast; not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. Christ being risen from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

"God will judge the world in righteousness by that man

whom he hath appointed, of which he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he raised him from the dead."

"If these things be so, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile bodies, that they may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the mighty working by which he is able to subdue all things to himself."

---

---

### PRAYER SUITED TO EASTER.

*(From Bishop Taylor.)*

**O** HOLY and eternal Jesus! who hast overcome death, and triumphed over all the powers of hell, darkness, sin, and the grave; manifesting the truth of thy promises, the power of thy divinity, the majesty of thy person, the rewards of thy glory, and the mercies and excellent designs of thy evangelical kingdom, by thy glorious and powerful resurrection; preserve my soul from eternal death, and make me to rise from the death of sin, and to live the life of grace; loving thy perfections, adoring thy mercy, pursuing the interest of thy kingdom, being united to the Church under thee our Head, conforming to thy holy laws, established in faith, entertained and confirmed with a modest, humble, and certain hope, and sanctified by charity; that I engraving thee in my heart, and submitting to thee in my spirit, and imitating thee in thy glorious example, may be partaker of thy resurrection, which is my hope and my desire, the support of my faith, the object of my joy, and the strength of my confidence.

In thee, Holy Jesus, do I trust: I confess thy faith, I believe all that thou hast taught; I desire to perform all thy injunctions: my soul is in thy hand, do thou support and guide it, and pity my infirmities; and when thou shalt reveal thy great day, show to me the mercies and effects of thy advocacy and intercession and redemption. *Thou shalt answer for me, O Lord, my God; for in thee have I trusted, let me never be confounded.* Thou

art just, thou art merciful, thou art gracious and compassionate, thou hast done miracles and prodigies of favour to me and all the world. Let not those great actions and sufferings be ineffective, but make me capable and receptive of thy mercies, and then I am certain to receive them. I am thine, O save me; thou art mine, O holy Jesus; O dwell with me for ever, and let me dwell with thee, adoring and praising the eternal glories of God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

---

## THE RESURRECTION.

*A Psalm of Thanksgiving, by the Rev. A. TROLLOPE.*

SHOUT, shout for joy, ye dead!  
 Bursting from the grave's dark prison,  
 Mighty victor, Christ is risen!  
 Cloth'd with pow'r he wings his flight  
 To realms of empyreal light,  
 And calls to promis'd bliss the  
       Saints for whom he bled.

Awake, awake, ye just!  
 Man's Redeemer hath ascended,  
 And the reign of death is ended.  
 Piercing nature's utmost bounds,  
 The Archangels' trump resounds,  
 That wakes to second life the  
       Dead that sleep in dust.

And see! they hear, they rise!  
 From the tomb's distended portal,  
 Light they spring to life immortal;  
 Thronging myriads press the air,  
 That scarce the countless hosts can bear,  
 Loos'd from the bands of death, and  
       Soaring to the skies.



CHORUS.

Exalted o'er the rest  
In that bright celestial dwelling,  
In glory, as in worth, excelling,  
Mercy leads her chosen band :  
Round their Redeemer's throne they stand ;  
And every deed of love with  
Tenfold joys is blest.

---

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*(From a Correspondent.)*

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the  
Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.*

[Continued from vol. v. p. 461.]

2. *Of Redemption.*

THE difference between the Calvinists and the Arminians, on this point, may be stated in few words. The former believe, that Christ died for those only, who are predestinated, agreeably to what they affirm under the preceding point ; and that salvation is not possible to others, although offered to them, in order to constitute a ground on which they may be at last condemned. The Arminians believe, that the satisfaction of Christ was for all mankind and for every one of them in particular ; although none reap the benefit, but those who believe and obey the gospel.

It will not be necessary, however, on the present point, to go into an investigation of the sense of the epistle. Much indeed is cited from it by the Calvinists ; but nothing which has not already come under the first article ; or else, which will not come under the third. All they offer, is as affecting the point, not directly, but by consequence.

As to the Arminians ; it is not here recollected, that any thing has been alleged by them to their purpose ; unless an ex-

ception may be made, of the latter part of the 5th chapter. In that passage, both Mr. Locke and Mr. Taylor of Norwich make the word "many" the same with "all;" and the word "all," in the place where it is used, to be intended universally. Not so Dr. Whitby, or Mr. Limborch; both of whom consider the sense of the place, as confining the terms to believers. The writer of this considers the passage as implying, that the effects of Christ's death are co-extensive with those of Adam's sin. Nevertheless, the universality of the propositions seems by him intended concerning the two descriptions of persons of whom they are affirmed. Whether he judges rightly or not in this particular, may be left for determination under the next point, where the passage will come under review.

### *3. Of Free Will\**

The substance of what has been said by Calvinists and by Arminians under the present point, turns on the unhappy effect of the fall of Adam; in consequence of which, man, besides becoming mortal, is so changed, that he cannot of himself begin or accomplish his recovery from the state of sin and misery; in which nature places him.

It would be a great mistake, to confound the loss of free will, so much spoken of in the controversies occurring in and soon after the æra of the reformation, with the necessarian scheme; which, however much a favourite with many modern Calvinists, was not the doctrine contended for by their early predecessors; and has not shown its head in the works of Calvin. Accordingly, when there is stated, that Calvinists and Arminians agreed in the loss of free will, the position is to be

\* It has been remarked by Mr. Locke, that freedom is applicable of action only. The applying of it to the will is conceived by him to be one of the many modes of expression, which occasion confusion of ideas: and he aptly illustrates his distinction by the case of a man, who, being conveyed during sleep into a room in which he awakes in agreeable society, willingly remains in his new situation, whatever hindrance there may be to his retiring from it. But independently on the propriety of the word, the controversy turns on the question of power in the will, called by the Latins "*liberum arbitrium*," but by the Greeks "*υπερβουλαιον*" and "*αυτοκρατορια*." It has also been in Latin "*ipsietas*." Whenever there may be used the word "free-will" in the present work, it must be understood in compliance with custom; and to mean the same with what has been commonly intended to be expressed by the aforesaid Latin and Greek words.

understood independently on that metaphysical subtilty ; and only means, that with whatever ability for the keeping of the law of the Creator, man had been originally clothed, he had become divested of it by the fall : so that his recovery cannot be either begun or perfected, otherwise than under the influence of divine aid.

Although this was always presented by the Arminians, as one of their points, both before and at the Synod which decided on their cause ; yet it does not appear to have made a part of their early controversy. So far as it goes, there was nothing against which the Calvinists could object. For the Arminians, however they may have differed from them as to the extent of the consequences of the fall, have agreed with them in this ; that nothing but a new act of grace and new aid founded on it, can restore to the forfeited life and immortality.

But if we extend our view to the writings of the Arminians generally ; we find in them sentiments utterly inconsistent with those maintained by the Calvinists, in relation to the apostacy.

The difference between the parties will be seen by a statement of what the latter superadd to the mortality, to the depraved nature, and to the utter inability acknowledged by the former.

The Calvinists consider the sin of Adam as made that of all mankind by imputation ; so that they are all on this account obnoxious to eternal misery ; from which a determinate number are rescued, by a predestinating decree. It is, however acknowledged, that God cannot condemn, to endless misery, a creature innocent in nature and in act. Accordingly it is expected, that mankind will be condemned, for sins committed in their own persons ; the result of a propensity to sin, which cannot be counteracted, but by a divine grace not given. As to infants, who cannot have committed actual sin ; they are subjected to the same condemnation, by a sinful nature ; the principle of all sin in act. Nevertheless, it is common for Calvinists to suppose—although this does not seem to arise out of the system—that they who are exempted by the divine Being from the temptations of the world have also been predestinated by him to salvation. Falling in with the idea of the permission of sin, for the vindicating of the justice of God, is that other of a federal headship ; in which we were represented in the first



man. For God is supposed to have established a covenant with him; and in him, with his posterity also: In consequence of which, as, in the event of his obedience, they would have inherited the reward of it, which was to have been everlasting life; so, theirs also was the forfeiture, which is everlasting misery. In regard to the stain descending, likewise, Calvinists declare more than the Arminians. For whereas these acknowledge, that man is in a sinful condition, from which he cannot relieve himself; and therefore, stands essentially in need of divine grace, for the accomplishing of the effect; the others pronounce, that until relieved from his state of defilement, all the thoughts which he entertains and all the actions which he performs are sins. It may be proper to subjoin, that the foregoing doctrine of a federal headship and that of the imputation of Adam's sin, with the consequences attached to them, make no part of the creed of the Arminians.

It is hoped, that a view is given, in substance, of the difference. If so, there is no need to go into the minutiae of the dispute; because the matter undertaken to be established is, that be the one side or the other right; or be the right of either in whole or in part; there is nothing in the epistle to the Romans, relative to any branch of the subject, on which the parties are divided. The writer of the epistle—it is here contended—was intent on another subject; which very much interested his mind and the minds of those for whom he wrote. He does indeed make a short digression, to the mortality incurred through Adam. But for what purpose? The answer is,—Because of its being a fit medium for the proof of the position, that since the said mortality affected Jew and Gentile alike; it was a ground from which to infer, that the counteracting efficacy of the death of Christ extended also to them both. St. Paul has also, in this epistle, referred to a taint of nature. But again let it be asked—For what purpose? Again it must be answered—Not with a reference to the present point; as though the writer were making it the theme of his argument; but because it fell in with the purpose which he had in view. This was the showing of the insufficiency of an instituted law, to the effect of justification: of a law, which far from restraining our bad propensities, made their sinful nature more conspicuous than before.

But to go on to the passages which have been thought applicable: The first passage to be here mentioned, is chapter iii. verse 9. But it is to be taken as explaining and to be explained by the greater part of the first and the second chapters; and a passage following it in the third.

The Apostle having, in the context, acknowledged the pre-eminent advantages of the Jewish nation; and having guarded against a false inference which might be drawn from his position; casts his eye back to the same advantages, and proposes the question (ver. 9)—“What then, are we better than they?” Or, more literally—“Have we a preference?” [*προεχομεθα*] He answers—“No, in no wise:” Or, which would seem a better translation—“not altogether;” meaning—we have a preference in the matter stated above; but not in the matter which is the subject of this discourse. Why? “Because we have before charged [as it is in the margin of our Bibles by a better translation of the Greek word *προητιμασαμεθα*] both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin.”

Let us attend, then to this charge; and first, as laid against the Gentiles. The Apostle, after having stated, [chap. i. ver. 25] that they had “changed the truth of God into a lie; and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator,” goes on thus [ver. 26 and following]—“Wherefore [that is, as an effect of this cause and not as a necessity of nature laid on them] God gave them up unto vile affections. For even their women did change the natural use, into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly; and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, unplacable, unmerciful: who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which com-

mit such things are worthy of death ; not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

So stands the charge, as it affected the Gentiles : And the Apostle, immediately after urging it on them, turns to the Jews ; and addressing the nation, through the medium of an individual character supposed ; he says [ver. 1.]—" Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest. For wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself ; for thou that judgest doest the same things." After amplifying and illustrating this sentiment, he goes on thus [ver. 17—32] " Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God ; and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law ; and art confident, that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes ; which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself ? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal ? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery ? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege ? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God ?"

Thus stands the charge, alluded to in the 9th ver. of the 3d chap. Now it is to be remarked, that since our present subject concerns human nature as such ; and since there are some circumstances in which it may be placed, not admitting of actual crime ; under such circumstances, the charge is not laid, because it speaks of actual crime only. But it is further to be remarked, that the Apostle is speaking, not of the human race as such ; but of all Jews and all Gentiles, standing each party in their corporate capacity ; and each in relation to the question of admission to the covenant of grace. For we run into manifest extravagances, if we consider the words as applicable to every Jew and every Gentile. First, it must be seen, that what the Apostle stated to have been charged, had not been charged on infants ; nor on those who die at too early an age, to have committed any of the enormous crimes enumerated. It will not relieve from the difficulty, to say, that there was a taint of



nature. There was so ; but it had not been charged ; none but actual sins and those of a very high grade being found in the catalogue. But further, it is beyond belief, that the Apostle should have designed to charge all adult Jews and all adult Gentiles, with having been guilty of the very bad conduct, truly affirmed to be prevailing among and tolerated by their several communities. In regard to the heathen, the grammatical construction fixes every article of the charge on all and every one of them ; if considered otherwise than in their collective capacities. Even considered individually ; St. Paul would never have accused a Socrates or an Antoninus, of any trait of character, which he has set down ; and doubtless, the same must be presumed of very many, both named and unnamed, in historic records. As to Jews ; it could never have been in his mind, to say to every one of them, that he had committed theft, or murder, or adultery, or sacrilege. And he must at least have been conscious, that himself was innocent of them all, when he said to the Sanhedrim—"Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God, unto this day." But the black catalogue of crimes will receive its proper application, if we keep in view the end of the Apostle's argument ; and not otherwise. The question concerned admission to the gospel covenant : The converted Gentiles did not set up a claim to it, on any other ground than that of mere favour. And therefore, there appears no motive to the making of mention of Gentile wickedness ; except that it was a conciliating introduction of what was about to be alleged, for the abating of the high pretensions of the Jewish converts—that the same wickedness was prevalent in their own nation. Accordingly, preference is here given, to the considering of the preposition—"for" [γὰρ] in the beginning of the second chapter, not as illative ; but as connective, agreeably to its ordinary signification ; although this is discountenanced by the high authority of Mr. Locke. Now the Jews considered themselves as in covenant with God ; which of course they held to be binding on his part, so long as the terms of it were unviolated on the other ; and this, not in the sense of the obedience of every individual, or of unsinning obedience in any ; the requiring of which would have been inconsistent with every idea of covenant between God and man ; and was certainly not stipulated for in the Mosaic ; which pointed out a

method of atonement for sins not presumptuous. But when the nation had showed itself corrupt, in the extent of licentiousness laid open by the Apostle ; it was in vain for individuals of it to set up a claim on the ground of a covenant, to which the former had been a party. And this might happen ; while yet there would be many Jews, coming under the description of the same Apostle, immediately subsequent to his other description of prevalent iniquity. What is here alluded to, are the last two verses of the second chapter ; where he says—" he is not a Jew who is one outwardly ; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh ; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly ; whose circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the latter ; whose praise is not of men, but of God." These words must have some meaning. They cannot, then, be designed of such a character, as neither did nor could exist ; but must be descriptive of every pious and conscientious Jew, who had lived between the giving of the law and the age in which the Apostles wrote.

If the sense here given to the portraiture of Jewish manners, require any further elucidation ; it may be obtained from what follows the verse, which is more immediately the subject of the present criticism. For the Apostle, referring to what he had said of his countrymen, justifies his apparent severity ; by showing, that it was no more than what had been said concerning the same nation, by the Psalmist in his day [verse 10—18]—" There is none righteous, no not one, there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become abominable, there is none that doeth good, no not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre ; with their tongues they have used deceit ; the poison of asps is under their lips. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways ; and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes."

These words, indeed, taken without regard to the connection and the design of them, are indiscriminate. But we know, that in a quotation, there is more regard had to the sense and the spirit of the passage quoted, than to the pertinency of every expression. Now the words are from the 14th psalm ; in which

they are descriptive of prevalent and triumphant wickedness, indeed; but not of such as was universal: For the Psalmist immediately adds, concerning the workers of wickedness described—"who eat up my people as they eat bread, and call not upon the Lord." He goes on to speak of "the generation of the righteous;" in whose behalf he puts up the devout wish—"O that salvation were given to Israel out of Zion." The Apostle's quoting of the gloomy description above recited, is as if he had said—"What the Psalmist has recorded of the prevalent wickedness of his day, I apply to ours." And the end of his applying of it was, that, as there could not be any claim on God's part of the covenant, in favour of a nation who had so flagrantly violated the conditions of it, obligatory on themselves; so, individuals of the same nation could have no pretensions, grounded on the supposed merits of the body of which they were a part; and consequently, must come in for their respective shares of the new covenant, as of grace and not of debt. And to this refers the Apostle's comment on the passage, which he had quoted from the Psalmist—"Now we know, that whatsoever things the law saith [meaning here by the law the whole body of Jewish scripture] it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." Guilty, more or less, they doubtless all are in his holy presence; and as such, "subject to his judgments," as the margin of the Bible more literally translates. But the Jew claimed exemption, in virtue of the covenant. No, says the Apostle, it has no virtue, as to that effect; and therefore the new dispensation contemplates all the world, that is, both Jews and Gentiles, as on a level in regard to pretence of merit.

*(To be continued.)*



*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

*In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, by the Rev. JAMES KEMP, D. D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.*

(Continued from p. 35.)

LETTER V.

*Testimony of the later Fathers.*

*Dr. Miller, vague and contradictory, as to the commencement of Clerical imparity. Tertullian. Cyprian. Firmilian. Jerome. Hilary. Chrysostom. Theodoret. Primasius and Sedulius. The case of Acrius considered. Eusebius strictly Episcopal. Milton an inveterate enemy to Episcopacy. Dr. Miller's four facts refuted. Ruling Elders unknown in the primitive Church. The result of the examination of the later Fathers. The Episcopal position as to the testimony of Scripture and the Fathers fully substantiated.*

REV. SIR,

WITH regard to the testimony of the later fathers, you lay down this principle, which in arguing with you must not be forgotten, "*that it is to be suspected.*" You also say, that about the close of the second century, "*among many other corruptions, that of clerical imparity appeared in the Church.*" Now, if this was the case, if the government of the Church was from this period avowedly Episcopal, why attempt to find proofs of a Presbyterian form? Or, why adduce the testimony of *suspicious men* in a question which upon your principles must be decided by other witnesses? But in the next page you seem to fix a different period for the commencement of *imparity*. "*Not a sentence can be found, until the fourth century, which gives any intimation, that Bishops were considered as a different order from Presbyters, or that the former were peculiarly invested with the ordaining power.*" That Bishops are a dif-

ferent order from Presbyters, and that they are vested with the peculiar power of ordaining, are among the principal features of clerical imparity, which you had told us began to make its appearance about the close of the second century. Here, there is, if not contradiction, a very great want of distinctness. But, be this as it may, we will proceed to the testimony of these Fathers, and endeavour to allow it its due weight, and no more.

Your quotations from Tertullian I shall put down in a different order from yours. "*De Baptismo*. 'It remains, that I remind you of the custom of giving and receiving baptism. The right of giving this ordinance belongs to the highest Priest, who is the Bishop, then to Elders and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the sake of the honour of the Church; this being secured, peace is secured; otherwise even the laity have the right.'" Here we have Bishops, Priests, and Deacons recognized. Here we have a line of distinction marked out, between the clergy and the laity; and here we find that both Priests and Deacons belong to the clergy. The right of giving baptism is said to belong to the highest Priest, who is the Bishop, and then to Elders and Deacons, with the authority of the Bishop. I am persuaded, no man will contend, that these are unfair or strained inferences. And surely it would be difficult, more clearly to designate the ministry that Episcopalians contend for. "*De Hæretic*. 'Let them (the heretics) produce the original of their Churches; let them turn over the roll of their Bishops; so running down in a continued succession, that their first Bishop had some one of the Apostles, or of the apostolic men (who persevered with the Apostles) for his author and predecessor. Thus the Apostolical Churches have their rolls, as the Church of *Smyrna* has *Polycarp* constituted there by *John*, and the Church of *Rome*, *Clement* ordained by *Peter*. And the other Churches can tell who were ordained Bishops over them by the Apostles, and who have been their successors to this day.'" This passage needs no comment. It is too plain to be misunderstood, and too definite to be perverted. The futility of the supposition, that these were mere common Presbyters, is evinced by this one fact, that the succession is reckoned by one line of single Bishops in the cities of *Smyrna*, *Rome*, &c.

Thus far Tertullian seems to be decidedly Episcopal; so

clearly so, that in my apprehension there is not room for a quibble. But in another work, *Apolog.* he says, "In our religious assemblies certain *approved elderly men* preside." And in *De Corona*, "We receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the hands of none but the *Presidents* of our assemblies." Now, in the first place, you have made his elderly men *Elders*; whereas the word in the original is *seniores*; while the Latin term for Elders, *Christian Ministers*, is uniformly *Presbyteri*. Elders might be elderly men, or they might not. So that, unless the sense be determined by some circumstance, it cannot be decided from the mere word itself, who these elderly men were. If it were said of the state conventions of our Church, that *elderly men, seniores*, preside, it would be strictly true. But if it were concluded that these were always *Elders*, the inference would be very false. For they are generally Bishops. The same mode of reasoning applies to Presidents. They may be either Bishops or other ministers, agreeably to the rules or usages of the Church. Now, if we are willing to pursue fair and logical reasoning, we shall conclude, that the persons here mentioned were Bishops. Tertullian has already told us that there were, in the Church, Bishops, Elders, and Deacons, and that Bishops baptized and administered the Lord's Supper. Hence these *elderly men* or *Presidents* must have been Bishops. But suppose we admit these *seniores, elderly men*, and Presidents, to have been Presbyters; what then? Will it follow by any rule of legitimate reasoning, that there were no Bishops? That Elders had a right to baptize, is admitted by Tertullian, and that they might also administer the Eucharist, under the authority of the Bishop, is proved from Ignatius. It seems then, that in no way, without an incorrect translation, can this Father be made to serve the cause of *parity*.

But however clear and particular Tertullian may be, as to the succession of Bishops, in several Churches, from the Apostles, you still insist that these Bishops may have been *Pastors* of single congregations. These congregations then must have been well supplied with ministers, for we know that at Smyrna and Rome there were several Priests and Deacons. And it has been clearly proved, that those called Presbyters by Ignatius were the Bishops of these cities. Even then, if the testimony of this Father had not been suspicious, it would have



done you little good : for, it would seem to me hardly possible to question the fact, that he considers the ministry of the Church as strictly Episcopal.

*Cyprian*, Bishop of Carthage, comes next under consideration : and I am exceedingly mistaken if this venerable Prelate, were he present to answer for himself, would acknowledge the doctrine ascribed to him by Dr. Miller. The passages upon which the principal reliance, it seems, is placed, are the following. “ *Epist.* 73. ‘ Whence we understand, that it is lawful for none but the *Presidents* of the Church to baptize and grant remission of sins.’ And again, *Epist.* 67. ‘ The people should not flatter themselves that they are free from fault, when they communicate with a sinful *priest*, and give their consent to the *presidency* of a wicked *Bishop*. Wherefore a *flock* that is obedient to God’s commands, and fears him, ought to separate from a wicked *Bishop*, and not to join in the sacrifices of a sacrilegious *priest*; since the flock or people has the chief power of choosing worthy *priests* and refusing unworthy ones, which we see comes down to us from divine authority, that the *priest* should be chosen in the presence of the flock, and in the sight of all, that he may be approved as worthy and fit, by the judgment and testimony of all. This is observed, according to divine authority, in the *Acts of the Apostles*, when *Peter*, speaking to the people concerning the ordination of a *Bishop* in the place of *Judas*; it is said *Peter* rose up in the midst of the disciples, the whole multitude being met together. And we may take notice that the Apostles observed this not only in the ordination of Bishops and Priests, but also of Deacons, concerning whom it is written in the *Acts*, that the twelve gathered together the whole multitude of the disciples, and said unto them, &c. which was, therefore, so diligently and carefully transacted before all the people, lest any unworthy person should, by secret arts, creep into the ministry of the altar, or the sacerdotal station. This, therefore, is to be observed and held as founded on divine tradition and Apostolic practice; which is also kept up with us, and almost in all the provinces, that in order to the right performance of *ordination*, the neighbouring *Bishops* of the same province meet with that *flock* to which the *Bishop* is *ordained*; and that the *Bishop* be chosen in presence of the people, who know every one’s life, and are ac-

quainted with their whole conversation. Which we see was done by you in the ordination of *Sabinus*, our colleague, that the *Episcopacy* was conferred on him by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood, and by the *Bishops* who were met there, and wrote to you concerning him.'

" *Epist. 32.* 'Through all the vicissitudes of time, the ordination of *Bishops*, and the constitution of the Church, are so handed down, that the Church is built on the *Bishops*; and every act of the Church is ordered and managed by them. Seeing, therefore, this is founded on the law of God, I wonder that some should be so rash and insolent as to write to me in the name of a Church, seeing a Church consists of a Bishop, Clergy, and all that stand faithful.'

" *Tract. De Unitat. Eccles.* 'Our Lord speaks to Peter, *I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church*, &c. Upon one he builds his Church; and though he gave an equal power to all his Apostles, yet that he might manifest unity, he ordered the beginning of that unity to proceed from one person. The rest of the Apostles were the same that Peter was, being endued with the same fellowship both of honour and power. But the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church may be shown to be one.'

" *Epist. 3.* 'The Deacons ought to remember, that the Lord hath chosen *Apostles*, that is, *Bishops* and *Presidents*; but the Apostles constituted *Deacons*, as the ministers of their Episcopacy and of the Church.'

The first inference that you draw from these quotations, is, that Bishop and President are used as words of the same import. Having, as I suppose, sufficiently illustrated this point, when considering the testimony of Tertullian, I think it needless to multiply repetitions.

You next, with a view to show that the Bishop was then the Pastor of a single congregation, state as the doctrine of Cyprian, that he was chosen by the people of his charge, was ordained over a particular *flock*, and received his *ordination* in the presence of that *flock*. Waving at present the manner of electing Bishops in those days, I shall just state, that although you have made use of the term *flock*, the language of St. Cyprian will not authorize you to limit that *flock* to the size of a single congregation. He says *ad eam plebem, to that people*.



And there is a circumstance which clearly shows that the charge of a Bishop was much more extensive; "*the neighbouring Bishops to the province*," for which the ordination was to be made, &c. *Province* therefore, and the *charge* of the Bishop, seem to be synonymous.

Besides, Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage. He flourished about fifty years later than Tertullian. Now, Tertullian tells us, that in his time the Christians were exceedingly numerous, the majority in most places. If then Cyprian was the only minister for the large and populous city of Carthage, in which there must have been many thousands of Christians, his charge must have been, by far, too extensive for one minister. To evade this difficulty, although you admit that you have no information, you hint, that some of his Presbyters may have been Ruling Elders, and some empowered to teach and administer the Sacraments. Suppositions without proof would neither weaken my cause nor strengthen yours. In this case, however, I have decided proof, that the Presbyters and Deacons of Carthage were all Clergymen. "We may take notice," says this Father, "that the Apostle observed this, not only in the ordination of Bishops and Priests, but also Deacons." And this, he adds, has continued in the Church. Still you say that Cyprian, in his exile, wrote to his Presbyters, to perform *his duties*, as well as *their own*. Cyprian's letters are addressed to his Deacons as well as to his Presbyters. *Cyprianus Presbyteris et Diaconis patribus.*" Now, if it follow from this, that Presbyters could perform the duties of a Bishop, it must also follow, that Deacons could. But the truth is, the only duty with which they were charged, was to carry into effect his judgment, in repelling some schismatic members from the communion. We do not find that they either ordained or confirmed a single individual.

The discerning reader will find that you are indeed sadly puzzled to make this venerable Prelate a Presbyterian in principle. Even when he says, "a Church consists of a Bishop and Clergy," &c. you find no distinction of order; having, by a fortunate ingenuity, made these Clergymen Preaching Elders. Still I cannot perceive how this corresponds with your system. I knew some Churches among the Presbyterians in Aberdeen, which had more than one Clergyman. But I never heard that



one was a Bishop and the others Preaching Elders. Nor did I ever understand that in the case of a minister who had an assistant, or assistants, his only distinction was that of *President* or *Chairman*. As to your application of the distinction made by St. Cyprian among the Apostles, it has not the shadow of authority, but is perfectly fanciful; nay, indeed, contradicted by the clearest passages of that Father. For he expressly recognizes three distinct orders of ordained ministers.

Your quotation from *Firmilian*, Bishop of Cæsarea, has been said to be incontrovertible. And I will readily grant, that if the language of this Father had corresponded with the translation of Dr. Miller, as far as his authority could avail, it would have been against us. But it still seems, that Episcopacy is not so easily destroyed. The term in the original, that you translate *Elders*, is not a title of office; it means *elderly men*—*maiores natu*. Now, before you could with propriety make these *elderly men*, *Elders* or *Presbyters*, you ought to have adduced some proof, independent of the term itself, to show who were meant. Allow the passage to stand unconnected, and we have as much right to conclude that these *elderly men* were Bishops, as you have that they were Presbyters or Elders. But when we peruse Firmilian a little farther, we find, that the same ministers, here denoted elderly men, are termed Bishops. While he says, in your quotation, "all power and grace are placed in the Church, where *elderly men* preside, in whom is vested the power of baptizing, and imposition of hands, and ordination;" he adds, in the next paragraph, "how is this, that when we see Paul baptized his disciples again, after John's baptism, we should make any doubt of baptizing them, who return from heresy to the Church, after that unlawful and profane baptism of theirs, unless Paul was less than those Bishops, of whom we are speaking now." Here then we find that Firmilian's *maiores natu*, *elderly men*, were *Bishops*.

We have now reached the celebrated St. Jerome. His testimony has been considered, before the time of Dr. Miller, as establishing Presbyterianism on a foundation that could not be moved. Dr. Miller has permitted us to receive it with caution, and not allow it the same weight with the testimony of the early Fathers. We are, therefore, authorized to prefer the latter, when they vary from St. Jerome.

We must also remark, that the temper of a man will give a peculiar complexion to his controversial writings. While it is admitted by all, that St. Jerome was a man of the most profound and extensive learning of his time, it is also admitted, that he was a man of an arduous and impetuous temper—overbearing and severe upon his adversaries. In this particular, respecting his character, Du Pin, Mosheim, and Le Clerc agree; nor does Erasmus say any thing to the contrary. So great was the number and variety of his writings, that he is sometimes inconsistent with himself. You, Sir, admit that he *loose*; but it is when he speaks of Episcopacy. When he leans to Presbyterianism he is *express* and *formal*!

The passage from his Commentary on Titus I shall first consider. “Let us diligently attend to the words of the Apostle, saying, *That thou mayest ordain Elders in every city, as I have appointed thee.* Who discoursing in what follows, what sort of Presbyter is to be ordained, saith, *If any one be blameless, the husband of one wife, &c.* afterwards adds, *For a Bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God, &c.* A Presbyter, therefore, is *the same* as a Bishop; and before they were, by the devil’s instinct, parties in religion, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, the churches were governed by the common council of Presbyters. But *afterwards*, when every one thought that those whom he baptized were rather his than Christ’s, it was determined through the whole world, that one of the Presbyters should be set above the rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong, that the seeds of schism may be taken away. If any suppose that it is merely *our* opinion, and not that of the scriptures, that Bishop and Presbyter are the same, and that one is the name of *age*, the other of *office*, let him read the words of the Apostle to the *Philippians*, saying, *Paul and Timothy, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons.* *Philippi* is a city of *Macedonia*, and certainly, in one city there could not be more than one Bishop, as they are *now* styled. But at that time they called the same men *Bishops* whom they called *Presbyters*; therefore, he speaks indifferently of Bishops as of Presbyters. This may seem even yet doubtful to some, till it be proved by another testimony. It is written in the Acts of the



Apostles, that when the Apostle came to Miletus, he sent to Ephesus, and called the Presbyters of that Church, to whom, among other things, he said, *Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.* Here observe diligently, that calling together the Presbyters of one city, Ephesus, he afterwards styles the same persons Bishops. If any will receive that epistle which is written in the name of Paul to the Hebrews, there also the care of the Church is equally divided among many, since he writes to the people, *Obeys them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as those that must give an account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief, for that is unprofitable for you.* And Peter (so called from the firmness of his faith), in his epistle, saith, *The Presbyters which are among you I exhort, who am also a Presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed. Feed the flock of God which is among you, not by constraint but willingly.* These things I have written to show, that among the ancients, Presbyters and Bishops were the same. But by little and little, that all the seeds of dissension might be plucked up, the whole care was devolved on one. As, therefore, the Presbyters know, that by the custom of the Church they are subject to him who is their President, so let Bishops know, that they are above Presbyters more by the custom of the Church than by the true dispensation of Christ; and that they ought to rule the Church in common, imitating Moses, who, when he might alone rule the people of Israel, chose seventy with whom we might judge the people."

One thing which this learned Father labours to prove is readily admitted by Episcopalians; that, during the time of the Apostles, Bishop and Presbyter was indiscriminately used for the same order. It is also clear, that in his time Bishops were distinct from and above Presbyters. "Let Bishops know that they are above Presbyters more by the custom of the Church than by the true dispensation of Christ." Now, the only question is, how this came to pass? Jerome is certainly at variance with himself here. At one time he says, "*it was decreed through the whole world.*" Now, if this have any meaning, it must imply, that it was a universal decree in the Church. But



in another place he says, this change was effected, *paulatim*, by degrees. This, I think, at least amounts to a proof, that either Jerome had no precise knowledge on the subject, or that he had pressed his argument farther than he could well maintain. Had he wished to make this part clear, why not tell us when and in what manner this innovation was accomplished. Having left us, however, in this predicament, we are as much at liberty to suppose that it was effected during the time of the Apostles, as you are to imagine that it was at a later period. If it was during the time of the Apostles, it is divine *usage*, which is all we contend for. Besides, on your hypothesis, we are allowed to give another solution to this difficulty. Jerome is not of equal authority with the early Fathers. Some of them, as has been already seen, explicitly admit, that the order which succeeded the Apostles soon obtained the fixed title of Bishops. And, moreover, this Father, in his zeal to prove his point, has omitted to state, that the Apostles were superior to the order of Presbyters or Bishops. This you admit. But you say, what has indeed no affinity to fact, that they were extraordinary ministers.—So far, then, the highly valued testimony of Jerome amounts to nothing. And if it be taken in connection with the primitive Fathers, it concludes in favour of Episcopacy, for they never hint at such a change in their time. And, of course, it barely stand as the opinion of an individual, as to the manner in which the Apostolic succession was preserved.

Your quotation from the epistle to Evagrius I shall omit, except the passage relating to the Church of Alexandria. The other is entirely to the same purpose with the quotation above.—The account of the Church of Alexandria I shall take the liberty to present in my own dress. “For at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist, even to Heraclas and Dionysius the Bishops, the Presbyters always chose one of themselves, placed him in a higher station, and called him Bishop, in the same manner that an army makes an emperor, or that Deacons choose one of themselves, whom they know to be diligent, and call him Archdeacon. For what does a Bishop, that a Presbyter cannot do, except ordination?” If, with your predecessor, Dr. Campbell, you insist that here Presbyters did every thing that was necessary to make a Bishop, you are contradicted by Jerome himself, who expressly says, that that right belonged to

the Bishop. It is true, you have separated the last sentence from the passage, although it is connected by the particle *for*, and you have given it a meaning that would require the word *then*, which is not there. "His position is, you say, that even *then* there was no right which they arrogated to themselves above Presbyters, excepting that of ordination." However it may delight you, Sir, to make Bishops appear arrogant, I should have imagined that you would hardly have hazarded to ascribe such a sentiment to St. Jerome, nor venture to interpolate a word to answer your purpose. For this very sentence will, for ever remain in the view of fair inquiry, as an incontrovertible proof, that the Presbyters of Alexandria did not consecrate their Bishops; and that, in the opinion of Jerome, they could not. Nor is it less extraordinary, that you should ascribe to this Father the opinion, that Deacons were not an order of clergy. For the whole purport of this epistle was to show, that they were an order inferior to Presbyters; besides, he expressly says, "in the epistles to Timothy and Titus there is mention made of the ordination of Bishop and Deacon."

Allowing then the testimony of Jerome its full weight, what does it prove? Does he any where tell us that Presbyters ordained? No; he expressly says, that that right belonged to Bishops. Does he point out any period of the Church, when there was only one order in the ministry? No; he contends that in the days of the Apostles there were two orders besides them. Does he deny the ministry of the Church in his time, to consist of three orders? No; he clearly designates this form of government; but he gives us a contradictory and blundering account of the appointment of Bishops, without specifying the time when this was done. Surely honest inquiry can place no reliance upon this! particularly while there are circumstances to render it highly probable, that all Jerome had in view, coincides exactly with Episcopal principles.

The purpose, he says, for which Bishops were appointed, was to prevent schism, which we know began to show itself in the days of the Apostles. They were unable personally to superintend every Church which they had planted; and the first Bishops which they appointed were, no doubt, from the number of Presbyters. St. Jerome declares, that there were others elevated to the rank of Apostles, besides those commissioned



by our Lord himself. His words are these: "By degrees others were ordained Apostles, by those whom our Lord had chosen, as that passage to the Philippians shows, *I supposed it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, your Apostle.*" Now, I see no way to give consistency to these opinions, but by admitting this to be the doctrine of Jerome. "*At first there were two orders in the ministry, besides the Apostles; Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons; but in process of time, when schism began to creep into those Churches, not immediately under the eye of the Apostles, they consecrated from the order of Presbyters, more Apostles, afterwards styled Bishops.* If this be the true meaning of Jerome, it is strictly Episcopal, and no other can be rendered consistent with what he advances on other occasions; as when he says, "the Bishops are all successors of the Apostles"—"What Aaron and his sons were, that we know the Bishops and Presbyters to be."\*

It does not appear to me, then, Sir, to require much *art* to show that the testimony of St. Jerome yields no clear and decided proof of *parity*, but the very reverse.

(*To be continued.*)

\* "I cannot find any argument of force in the New Testament, to prove that ever the Christian Churches were under the sole government of Presbyters. For what St. Jerome allegeth, doth by no means prove it; I grant he proves that the name of Bishop and Presbyters were at that time common to the same persons; but what then? Suppose the Bishop and Elder here in Timothy's epistle were the same, doth this prove that these governed the Church without Timothy? The true question is not about the *sense* of words, but about the *authority* of these Bishops or Presbyters, i. e. whether the whole care of their Churches were committed to them without any superior jurisdiction? What if it be yielded to St. Jerome, that the Bishops and Deacons at Philippi were no other than the Presbyters and Deacons, as long as the Apostle, either in person or by some other appointed by himself, did rule over them? What if the Bishops summoned to Miletus, were no other than the Pastors and Teachers? Did not St. Paul himself, at that very time, call them together, and give a charge and direction to them, as one who had authority over them? So that it doth no where appear in scripture, that the Presbyters were invested with *supreme* power over the Church." *Stillingfleet's Ordination Sermon.* This is the mature and well digested opinion of a man, who had in early life committed himself upon Church polity, and is, we will venture to say, strictly scriptural.



## R E V I E W.

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*A Charge to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, delivered in Christ Church, in the City of Philadelphia, on Wednesday, May 27, 1807. By William White, D. D. Bishop of the said Church. 8vo. pp. 56. Philadelphia. Printed at the Office of the United States Gazette. 1807.*

[Concluded from vol. v. p. 228.]

A COPY of this Charge in which we had made short notes for the purpose of reviewing it, was mislaid. This circumstance has unavoidably occasioned a delay. The Charge abounds with matter so useful and interesting both to the clergy and laity of the Church, that we feel disposed to make liberal extracts from it.

The subject which it discusses is the divine origin of the Christian Church; and the duties thence resulting, particularly in reference to the clergy. The review of this Charge in our last volume contained an extract, enforcing the importance of the truth of the divine institution of the Christian Church, and exhibiting the proofs of it. Passing on to the inferences from this important principle, the Right Reverend author first insists on "the integrity of principle and the purity of manners, which should adorn those who are called to any office or administration in the Church." As incompatible with that sanctity of morals, and that devotedness to duty which should distinguish the Clergyman, the Bishop considers not only *immorality*, and *levity* of character, but the

"Being engaged too often and too long in those intercourses of social life, in which there are discussed the business or the policy of the world; or whatever else is a usual theme of innocent conversation. For it is the symptom of a mind, not habitually intent on the subjects, by which it should be the most of all occupied; and to which it is continually liable to have its attention drawn, by occasions of pastoral advice and consolation; reluctantly complied with, when the subjects of them interfere with others, in which a more powerful interest is felt."

We do not intend to discuss the question, how far participation in worldly amusements is absolutely *lawful* in clergymen; nor shall we presume to enforce the opinion of Bishop White on this subject, by any arguments of our own. But the interests of religion and the prosperity of the Church depend so much upon the sanctity of manners in the clergy, that we trust we shall be excused for presenting the following opinions of prelates who held the highest stations in the English Church.

"A minister of God's word, attentive to his duty, will neither have *leisure* for *dissipations*, public or domestic, nor liking to them. He will see that *pleasure*, or rather a wretched affectation of it, is become the idol of mankind; to which they are sacrificing their fortunes, their families, their healths, their reputations, their regard to God, to their social duties, to the state of their souls, to their future being. Now what are the clergy to do in this case? If we but seem to go along with them, who shall call them back? For as to the pretence of *keeping them within bounds* by our presence, it is merely a *pretence*. Or, were it not, the *older* and *graver* of us would surely think such a superintendency no very honourable one, and few of the *younger* and *livelier* would be safely trusted with it. Indeed, we none of us know into what improprieties of behaviour, at least what wrongness of disposition we may be drawn by the *evil communications* of these assemblies: whether if, happily they should not otherwise *corrupt* our *good manners*, we may not however grow inwardly fond of them; come to think our profession a dull one, and the calls of it troublesome; throw off as much of the burden as we can, and perform with reluctance and cold formality the remainder, which we must."

"A habit visibly a clergyman's, must be such in every part as befits a clergyman, have no look of effeminacy or love of finery in it—I need not add that our whole demeanour should be answerable to our clothing; that softness and delicacy of manner; skill in the science of eating, and the perfection of liquors; in short, every *approach* to *luxurious gratification*, is strangely out of place in one who hath devoted himself to *endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ*."

ARCHBISHOP SECKER.

"It will be found very clear, that the different degrees of *respect* and *authority* which ministers enjoy, depend upon no one thing, so much as their mixing or not mixing, with the laity in those diversions and freedom of life. It is true, the submitting to such mixtures, may gain them the reputation of good nature. But that reputation may be easily got and main-



tained without it, and is certainly bought too dear, at the expense of their proper character as *ministers of the gospel*. Or, it may endear them to free and irregular livers, who delight in nothing more than to see clergymen become sharers in their irregularities. But whether that in the end, proves the foundation of inward respect, or inward contempt, is too plain to be made a question."

BISHOP GIBSON.

"It is always dangerous to religion, when the manners of the clergy become too much *secularised*. This will always lower the order in the eyes of the people, and lessen their general reverence for the offices of religion—A mind habitually intent upon the greatest subjects, and a thirst for the highest knowledge will discover itself in the *dignified sobriety* even of his relaxations; which will impress his familiar friends and companions with respect, and the profane with awe; while the latter, however they may delight in the company, and pretend to applaud what they may call the free and easy manners, will in their hearts despise, and not seldom to his face make a jest of the social gay Anacreon in the formalities of a gown and cassock."

BISHOP HORSELY.

We trust that no part of our Church will ever have seriously to lament the prevalence of that spirit of party which the Bishop in the following extract so forcibly deprecates.

"Although every part of the common life of a clergyman displays a scope for the exercise of Christian virtue; yet there is especially a call for it, in whatever relates immediately to his function. In this, what great occasion does it give of triumph to the enemies of religion and of grief to its advocates and friends; when they behold in those to whom her interests are intrusted, a spirit of party, and a disposition to make all subordinate to personal interest or glory; sometimes in so great a degree, as to produce animosities and divisions, of which the evident object is individual interest and exaltation. Of such a spirit, we see much in what relates to the policy of the world; but never without disapprobation of the character in which it is found; nor without considering it as incompatible with the real love of country. And if this resists the contamination of the foul mixture; how much more so must the holy genius of a dispensation, which has God for its author and the eternal happiness of heaven for its end."

The second improvement which the Bishop makes of the important truth, *the divine origin of the Christian Church*, is,

"To take notice, that it is a great incitement to diligence in the discharge of the duties of the ministry, and a great encouragement under them. For what less are they, than the carry-



ing into effect of the eternal counsels of the Most High, in the most important department of his moral government? And we are sure, that every successful labour therein, will have its effect on the issue."

His second inference is,

"The duty of caution in the admission of persons to the ministry; which should be kept in view, in the recommendation of candidates."

On this point, justly deemed of the highest importance, the last General Convention established an additional security, by requiring that no person shall be considered even as a *candidate for orders*, until he has been recommended by the Standing Committee to the Bishop: who then has it in his power to institute such further inquiries as may be necessary to his satisfaction. Every friend of the Church must wish that these powers may be faithfully exercised. The avenues to the ministry should be rigorously guarded. In proportion as its respectability and its emoluments increase, will be the danger of persons approaching it, from improper motives; deficient in the piety, the zeal, the prudence, or the talents which alone can enable them honourably and successfully to discharge its high duties.

But piety is not the only qualification. In the judgment of the Bishop,

"There is a particular, in regard to which, there may perhaps be more positive evidence, than has been exacted in some cases: It is, the party's preference of the distinguishing properties of our communion; without which, there can be no security against his materially deviating from the public worship of our Church, nor from his combining with it practices not sanctioned, and even impliedly disapproved. It may be supposed, that this is sufficiently guarded against by the engagements, without which there can be no admission to the ministry. But it is a melancholy fact, that even these have not been a defence against such intrusions. And this I consider as one among the many evidences with which experience has supplied me, that enthusiastick zeal has a pernicious influence on the sense of practical obligation. How far change of religious sentiment may disengage men from promises pledged to a communion which they think they see reason to abandon, must rest on the ground of convictions, the sincerity of which can only be judged of by God and by themselves. But for any one to insinuate himself into a church, with sentiments hostile to its

order and under vows which he has no intention of observing; is a profanation, that may be classed with those perjuries in certain departments of civil life, which are said to mock the administration of our laws. Let us not be content with the avoiding of any thing like this, but also discountenance it in others. Our Church has prescribed a form of prayer; she thinks it warranted by the practice of the Church in the earliest ages, as far back as any remains of that practice are to be traced; and not by that only, but by the attendance of our Lord, on the prescribed devotions of the temple and of the synagogue; the evidences that they were established forms being equally authentic with those of the four books, containing the history of his blessed life. The plea for departing from this order, is the greater increase of piety. But may not men be under the government of a piety, mixed with much error? They may; and, in this instance of the violation of order, they surely are. I mean, where piety of any sort is the motive: For, in the greater number of the instances falling under my observation, I have been compelled to ascribe it to mere vanity and the exaltation of self.

No person can deem this language too strong. To mould the service of the Church to private fancy or convenience, is to violate the most solemn vows; to contemn that authority by which only the Church as a society can subsist; and to endanger her purity, her order, her very existence. The Liturgy is that pure flame on the altar of the sanctuary which in seasons of darkness has shed forth evangelical truth; and in periods of declension has tended to warm the heart with the emotions of fervent yet rational devotion. In times of peril, this Liturgy, under God, has proved the salvation of the Church; and were she loosened from this anchor, she would be in danger of being tossed on the contending waves of schism, and of being "carried to and fro by every wind of false doctrine." *Obsta principiis*, is a maxim of the soundest policy; and therefore the friends of the Church should be on their guard not only against glaring departures from the Liturgy, but against those lesser innovations equally unsanctioned; and dangerous, because leading to greater violations.

The necessity of literary qualifications the Bishop considers as obvious.

"We are agreed, I trust, that the having of a learned ministry is deserving of whatever pains may be bestowed for the accomplishment of it. The divine Being has been pleased to im-

part to us a revelation of his will, under a form, in which it cannot be applied to edification, without a knowledge, to be possessed at least by some, of various branches of literature, which contribute to the ascertaining of the true sense of scripture."

Most of the religious denominations in this country are prosecuting plans for securing a learned ministry with a zeal worthy of the highest commendation. Some of them require two, and others four years of theological study. They have organized theological institutions, in which, by the pious munificence of individuals,\* ample provision is made for the support of Professors, and for the education of young men for the ministry. We trust Episcopalians take notice of all this; and will not be backward in efforts, to secure to their Church, a ministry not only of piety, but of learning and talents. The Episcopal Church is fast emerging from the many singular difficulties with which she has had to contend. And, under God, her future prosperity must depend upon the means taken to furnish her with a learned, as well as pious and zealous ministry. The last General Convention made many judicious regulations, calculated to raise the tone of qualifications for the ministry; and every friend to the Church must hope that these regulations will be rigorously carried into effect.

"The duty of giving effect to the discipline of the Church" is another inference from the subject of his charge which the Bishop urges with force indeed; but not with more force than the subject deserves. Considered merely as an human institution, the Church must surely possess the power, and her honour and interests require the exercise of it, to punish and even to exclude unworthy ministers and members. This, however, was one of those powers committed to her by her divine Head, for the faithful exercise of which an account must be rendered. On this subject Bishop W. makes some important remarks, which we give in his own words.

"I embrace the opportunity of making a remark not obvious to every mind, but the propriety of which, when proposed,

\* A Theological Institution has lately been established in Massachusetts, under the auspices of the congregationalists of Calvinistic sentiments; to which one person gave 30,000 dollars, and two or three others very large sums.



must be perceived (one would hope) by all. It is, that your Bishop has less responsibility than any other minister or member of the Church, as to the beginning of measures, for the purging of our Church from such dishonour. In a concern in which he must necessarily be called to judge, it would ill become him to take any step, which might reasonably cause him to be considered as an accuser. How far he may address advice, in regard to indiscretions or omissions, not subject to ecclesiastical trial; and even how far he may do the same, on common fame of fault of a higher grade; not presuming facts, and with the professed view of guarding against even the appearance of the evil, are questions of another kind. His doing of what has been described ought to depend on his opinion, how far he has so much influence with the party, as to render what he should say effective. At any rate, this is a different subject from that of interfering in the strict line of duty; which you will acknowledge to be in him improper, until formally and officially required: And as he has in one instance, when so called on, carried the canons into effect, by the degradation of a minister; it ought to be supposed, that he would do the like again, should a cause for it unhappily occur.

"I may therefore presume, that any of my clerical brethren may be under a call of duty, to take an earlier part than myself, in bringing an offending brother under censure. If so, it is to be hoped, that duty will not be sacrificed to indifference, or to the apprehension of offence. You are too well acquainted with my habits of thinking, to suspect me of the wish of extending ecclesiastical authority, to the judging of the hearts of men, otherwise than by their actions: And we are all aware, that there may be mournful deficiencies, which no laws and no fair methods of investigation can reach. But if there should be cases to which this does not apply; and in which misconduct is so conspicuous, as that it is beyond the power of charity to overlook, or of prudence to conceal; let us not, my brethren, fail in what we owe, in such cases, to the Church, and to her divine Head.

The desire to exercise authority with the most scrupulous and impartial justice so evidently displayed in the above extract, ought not certainly to be considered as incompatible with the high Episcopal duties of inspecting the conduct of the Clergy; of addressing to them such admonitions as prudence may dictate; and even where *facts are not presumed*, of instituting measures for ascertaining the truth or falsehood of "common fame" relative to the faults of a Clergyman.

The mode of trying Clergymen is left to the regulation of

the State Conventions of the Church ; and they have generally placed the power of presentment with the Vestries, with the body of the Convention, or with a certain number of individual Presbyters. Though it is certainly incumbent on the Vestry of a Church to present for trial an unworthy Clergyman residing among them, there is reason to fear they will not always be ready to do their duty in this particular. There are many difficulties in the way of the exercise of it by the State Conventions. And to leave the duty of presentment to the voluntary zeal of individual Presbyters, is to place it on a very *delicate* and uncertain footing. It is desirable that there should be some permanent body, few in number, and easily convened, whose *duty* it shall be to examine, in the case of any Clergyman, whether there appears cause for presentment; and to take measures accordingly. The tendency of this plan would be; frequently to arrest rumours unfavourable to the character of an innocent Clergyman; and, at the same time, to bring the guilty to punishment. We believe that in the State of Maryland, this duty is vested with the Standing Committee of the Church.

To those persons who are in the habit of giving such undue preference to the ministrations of any particular Clergyman as to leave their accustomed places of worship, we would recommend the perusal of the following extract. For the conduct here censured Churchmen can have no excuse. They possess a Liturgy, in which, whatever be the talents of the preacher, they may find all necessary edification, and discharge the most important duty of worshipping God.

“Independently on irritation and controversy, there is a mere indulgence of fancy, which carries unstable people from one communion to another, on very inadequate pretences; among which, one, perhaps as little defensible as any, is the comparative merits of different ministers, in respect either to their personal characters or their professional accomplishments. It might have been expected, that there would have been a sufficient restraint from this, in the censure on those who said: ‘I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas.’\* But if the important record should not have weight with all the laity; we at least should be admonished by it, to discountenance and dissuade men from what we cannot but perceive to be at best human infirmity; sheltering itself under the plausi-

\* 1 Cor. i. 12.

ble plea of a view to edification. And especially it concerns us to be aware of taking advantage to ourselves, from such caprice. For where a Clergyman manifests a disposition—I will not say to excite, but to avail himself of what so evidently tends to the destroying of the Church's peace; he gives a decisive proof, that the end of his calling is a lower consideration with him, than the gratification either of his avarice or of his vanity: Especially as he cannot but know, of persons who in this way prop his interest and his reputation, that they are seldom among those who are ornaments of the Christian name and character."

Our limits will not allow us to follow the Bishop through the latter part of his charge, in which he discusses the subject of Episcopacy, and maintains its Apostolic origin. In an appendix, alluding to a pamphlet written by him, supposed by some to contain anti-Episcopal opinions, he thus disavows the fact.

"To those who, being averse to the Apostolic origin of Episcopacy, have considered him as having consented with them in opinion; he is ready to declare, on every suitable opportunity, that the contrary was intended to be implied, and that it is obvious, according to his conceptions, on the face of the performance."

We shall close our review, with another extract.

"It is not an object with me, to allude to the opinions of other communions: And if I do it in this place, it is merely that I may be the more clearly apprehended, as to a property of our own. The ablest of the non-Episcopalian writers have dated the rise of the Episcopacy in the second century.\* Now

\* "In a well known book written by Lord Chancellor King, there is taken a different ground from the one here alluded to. According to that work, there is no need, in order to the dispensing with the succession, to suppose innovation in the second century; the theory being that, although there was but one Bishop, in any church, he was superior to Presbyters in the same, not in order, but in degree: He had the charge of the whole flock; and they were his assistants; each of them being equally with himself in respect of ecclesiastical commission, competent to such a charge.

"The author of the present performance thought he had no need to refer to the principle above stated, as it seems to him to have little weight among men of literary reputation, of communions professedly non-episcopalian: And besides, he has never met with any person who had read Lord King's book and the Reverend Mr. Slater's answer to it, who did not appear sufficiently secured by the latter, against any undue impressions, which might otherwise have been a consequence of the other.

"It is indeed surprising, that a gentleman who lived to fill the first law office of England should, even in his early years, have sent from under his pen a book so unsound in principle and so full of misquotations and mistranslations:



if it could be believed, that, at a time when there was little intercourse besides that of mutual charity among the different churches of Christendom, such a change took place in them all, without any record of the steps which led to it, or of any discussion produced by a considerable departure from practice so recently and by so high authority established; still, the contrary would be a position which our Church maintains: And accordingly, this is a property of her system, which every one of her ministers, while he continues such, is bound to carry into effect, in all the obvious consequences resulting from it. Let it not be thought, that there is any interference of this, with the sacred claims of Charity. For if those claims are to set aside whatever distinguishes us from many whom we cannot but esteem and love; and of whose Christian temper and conduct we must have had ample evidence; there is not any one of our services, or either of our sacraments, which we shall retain. In the usual intercourses of social life, there are many opportunities of manifesting the spirit of Christian charity: And even in regard to difference of religious sentiment, it is better manifested by respect and candor; and especially by the prevention of our intrusion of our angry passions within the sacred sphere of the discussion of religious truth, than by an accommodation which destroys order. And indeed this, while its professed object is love and peace, is frequently the occasion of divisions, more and worse than those which it is solicitous to remove."

We trust the above extract completely vindicates from the charge of unnecessary and imprudent zeal, and illiberal bigotry, those public discussions which ~~we~~ have had in view, the duty here enjoined "to carry into effect," the doctrine of the Apostolic origin of Episcopacy, "in all the obvious consequences resulting from it." Among other advantages of these discussions is, certainly that of enabling the laity of the Church to fulfil that much neglected duty, on which, in the conclusion of his charge, the Bishop insists—

"Not only so, there results an obligation on such lay members, to be so informed of the grounds of the discipline, of the

And it will be a remarkable fact in the ecclesiastical history of this country, that disregard of the episcopal succession, in the framing of the ministry of a very numerous society, was owing to conviction received from said book; composed by a young man of the age of twenty-two; answered with great ability near the time of its appearance; and not since defended by the author or by any other person. The fact alluded to appears in an instrument from under the hand of the late reverend John Wesley, set forth at the time of his authorizing the ordinations in America.

worship and of the doctrines of our Church, as may prevent error in their part of the proceedings; and further, may enable them to explain and advocate our system."

---

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*The Presence of Christ the Glory of a Church: a Discourse, preached November 6, 1808, at the opening of the fourth Presbyterian Church, in Cedar-Street, New-York. By John Rodgers, D. D. 8vo. pp. 24. New-York. J. Seymour. 1808.*

**E**PISCOPALIANS have a religious ceremony, which they style the office of consecration of churches; in which, by solemn supplication and praise, the building is set apart from all common and secular uses, to the worship and service of Almighty God. In this office of consecrating churches, primitive and uniform usage has assigned the chief authority to the Bishop in whose diocese the church may be erected, and to whom it is to be subject. Reasonable as this solemn dedication to God of a building designed to his worship must appear; and sanctioned as it is by ancient usage; there have not been wanting some who have decried it as superstitious, and worthy only to be placed among the anti-Christian mummeries of the Church of Rome. It affords us pleasure to find that many of those prejudices which have induced our Presbyterian brethren to reject ceremonies in themselves reasonable, appropriate, and pious, merely because the Church of Rome abused, and the Church of England adopted them, are wearing away. As one evidence of this, the custom of dedicating churches, or of setting them apart by solemn acts of prayer and praise to religious and holy uses, is now commonly practised by those whose forefathers would have turned with horror from such superstitious ceremonies.

The sermon before us was preached at the opening of the fourth Presbyterian Church, in Cedar Street, New-York; when, we presume, the blessing of God on the ministrations to be performed in the house set apart for his service, was invoked in appropriate acts of prayer and praise. We are gratified to find that, though, for this decent and pious purpose of dedicating a

church to Almighty God, our Presbyterian brethren were destitute of the officer to whom immemorial authority has assigned the duty, they came as near as possible to Episcopal usage. The duty was very properly confided to one, who, from his venerable standing and piety, may be considered as possessing Episcopal influence, though, in our judgment, not Episcopal power.

Episcopalians too have been in the habit of ascribing *relative holiness* to churches. They reverence them as *holy*, on account of the sacred uses to which they are devoted, and the presence of God in the valid ministrations performed in them. This notion too has been discarded by some, as savouring of anti-Christian superstition. And forgetting that law of our nature which wisely associates the reverence for certain religious solemnities, with the places and persons employed in them, they treat the sacred edifices in which the name of God is invoked, with the same familiarity with which they regard a building designed for secular uses. These irreverent notions derive no sanction from the sermon before us. On the contrary, it contains many sentiments in perfect accordance with Episcopal principles. We are, indeed, fully satisfied, that a candid mind, rejecting the shackles of party, and singly pursuing truth, will be led to adopt many of those principles, for maintaining which Churchmen have received no small share of ridicule and obloquy. We proceed to examples.

How often have Churchmen been ridiculed and censured for drawing any illustrations of the constitution of the Christian Church from the Jewish economy! And yet we find the author of this sermon expressly asserting,

“That the ancient temple was a type or symbol of the Church.”

Surely then the Episcopal argument is not so contemptible, that as there was a ministry in the Jewish temple, there must be one also in its anti-type, the Christian Church; and that as there were three orders in the former, it is reasonable to presume, there would be three orders in the latter.

We were also forcibly struck with the following judicious and correct delineation of the powers of the Christian ministry.

“This is his (Christ’s) faithful promise:—‘where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I in the midst of them.*’ And this he is,



"By *administration of his word and ordinances*, that is, by the preaching of the word, and the administration of the gospel sacraments. Need we stay here to prove, that these are the institutions of Christ our Lord? We address a congregation of professed Christians, and may therefore doubtless take it for granted. But the ministers of the gospel, in the regular dispensation of them, act in the name of Christ, and by virtue of an authority derived from him. They bear his commission for this purpose—"Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, *I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.*" Here they have not only the authority of Christ; but are assured of his gracious presence with them, in the proper discharge of their high trust—"Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Agreeably to this, faithful ministers are styled '*Workers together with Christ.*' While they are in the regular and faithful discharge of their office, they, in some sense, personate and represent their Lord Christ. Thus by the preaching of the word, they act under Christ as a *prophet*; for he teaches by his word. And this is the great business of preaching, to explain and confirm the important doctrines, which Christ as a prophet has taught us in his word.

"In their prayers, they act under him as a *Priest*; in which character he intercedes for us before the throne of God. And by publicly explaining and inculcating the laws of Christ, as well as in the regular exercise of discipline, they act under him, and serve his interests as the great *King* and *Head* of his Church. Thus are Gospel ministers workers *together* with Christ; and thus is he present with his Church, *in and by them*; or, rather, *in and by those divine institutions*, in which they minister to his Church before him."

Here we find asserted that important principle for which Episcopalians zealously contend—the divine and exclusive commission of the ministry. Nay, the very analogy by which Episcopalians establish the powers and duties of the ministry is adopted. The duly authorized ministers of Christ act under him as *Prophets, Priests, and Rulers* of the Church.

Again—what a load of censure hath been cast on Episcopalians for the stress which they lay on *external order*—for confining God's covenanted mercy to *ordinances*, and thus undervaluing the efficacy of faith. Now attend to the following.

"In that God hereby *owns his church and people*, AS HIS COVENANT PEOPLE. Christ, you have heard, is present with his

church, in and by the gospel sacraments, baptism, and the Lord's supper. But these are the seals of God's covenant love: the language of them is, that of Heb. viii. 10—"I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."

And further—"The Church thus blessed becomes the *birth place of souls*—a nursery for heaven."

Could an Episcopalian insist more emphatically on the importance of *external order*? "The Church—the *birth place of souls*, a nursery for heaven!!!" Had we used this language, we know a person who would have reprimanded us, (and not very gently) for laying undue stress on external order; and derogating from the *merits and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ*! The venerable author of this sermon maintains, "that the sacraments are the seals of God's love, and (p. 19) that "the Ministers of Jesus act in all their ministrations in the name of Christ, and by virtue of an authority derived from him." Is it not then of the utmost importance to ascertain the *mode* by which this authority is derived? Must Episcopalians be censured for pursuing this inquiry? Can this authority be derived in any other way than by succession? Yes, *uninterrupted succession* from Christ himself. And if Bishops have universally till within these few centuries, been in exclusive possession of the right of conveying this authority, it is incumbent on their opponents to show (and this they in vain attempt to do) *when*, and by *what means* they obtained this exclusive possession.

The reverend author of this sermon enjoins "decency in all the several appendages of our worship; such as our *apparel*, our behaviour in the Church of God, and the like."

What church has prescribed such *decent* order for public worship, equally remote from the "pageantry" of the Church of Rome, and the unattractive *plainness* of Puritanism, as the Episcopal Church? What! is "apparel" in the house of God of importance? The decent habiliments of the Episcopal Clergy have been sometimes derided as *superstitious* and *Popish*. We know indeed some of our Presbyterian brethren who appear graced with that identical *Church of England gown and cassock*, which their forefathers made one principal cause of separation from that Church! We commend them for their regard to "decency of apparel" in the ministrations of the sanc-

tuary ; and we know no habiliments more decent and appropriate than those of the Episcopal Clergy.

We conclude our review of this very judicious discourse with the following extract :

“ Make conscience of attending on the public institutions of God’s house. Your duty and your interest both conspire to invite you to this. It is your duty—It is matter of express command, Heb. x. 25—“ Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is.” Again, consider your primary business at the house of God. It is *to pay acts of social and public homage to the great Jehovah*. Herein the worship of the sanctuary bears the nearest affinity to the business and employments of heaven, of any service we can perform here on earth ; for the worship of heaven is public and social worship. Now none surely will dispute, but that it is our duty to pay acts of public and social homage to the most high God ; to undertake to prove this, would be an affront to your understandings, and your professions as Christians. Hence, then, you see, that the very nature of your primary business at the house of God, and your employment when there, prove, that it is your duty to make conscience of attending upon them.”

Would to God that the voice of the venerable preacher could impress this exhortation permanently on the hearts, not only of his own, but of all other denominations. The “ primary business at the house of God,” which is “ public and social worship,” is comparatively disregarded. It is considered principally as the place of *hearing sermons*. Little value is placed on the exercises of *prayer* and *praise*. The *talents* of the preacher are principally regarded—the *sermon* exalted above the *service* : and yet, it is most certain that, unless the habits of prayer and praise be formed in the soul, a man may be busied all his life in hearing sermons as eloquent as those which fell from the lips of Paul himself, and still be *far, very far* from the kingdom of heaven.



## ECCLESIASTICAL NEWS.

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*[We shall gratefully receive and insert historical sketches of the different Churches.]*

HISTORICAL SKETCH of ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, in Elizabeth-Town, New-Jersey: By its Rector, the Rev. JOHN C. RUDD.

NO data can be found by which to state the precise time when this church was built. Circumstances, however, induce us to believe that it is at least one hundred and forty years since the body of the building was erected. It was not, however, till about the year 1751 that the congregation became a body corporate. Previously to the settlement of Dr. Thomas Chandler, in this year, the only clergyman who administered the word and ordinances for any considerable time together, was the Rev. Mr. Vaughan. Before this time the congregation enjoyed no more than occasional service. Dr. Chandler was ordained by the Bishop of London, in the latter part of the year 1750, or in the beginning of 1751.

In him the congregation were very happy, and under his ministry, their affairs were very prosperous. He distinguished himself as an able writer in behalf of the Church. At the commencement of the American revolution, he deemed it expedient to suspend the discharge of his parochial duties, and go to England, where he resided till the year 1785.—His health, however, was so deeply impaired by a cancerous affection, that he was never able after his return to perform any more than some of the occasional offices of the Church.

The event of the Revolution defeated a plan which had been formed for building a new Church. Money had been raised, materials collected, and a foundation for the intended building was nearly finished. All these, by the war, were exposed to depredation and destruction. And even the little building which yet remains, humble and rude as was its structure, did not escape the hand of violence. The organ and pews were totally destroyed.

The Rev. Samuel Spraggs, who resided in the parish at the time Dr. Chandler died, was chosen Rector in the year 1790. In him the people were happily united. He died in the year 1794. He was succeeded by the Rev. Menzies Rayner. He removed to Hartford, in Connecticut. The Rev. Frederick Beasley was his successor, and continued till the year 1803, when he removed to Albany. He was followed by the Rev. Samuel Lilly, who officiated till the spring of 1805, when he resigned his rectorship, and shortly after went to South-Carolina, where he died in July 1807. The present Rector, who was ordained Deacon by the Right Rev. Bishop Moore, in April 1805, received a call, and took up his residence in the parish, in December of the same year—Upon his admission to priest's orders, in May 1806, he was instituted.

The congregation consists of about 80 families, of whom 73 are communicants—though few in number, they have a very strong attachment to the Church, and exercise a liberality which deserves commendation, and may well be imitated. Their disposition has been sufficiently evinced in their endeavours to render their Clergyman as pleasant and as comfortable as is in their power. Their voluntary subscriptions for his support, would by many be regarded as a very grievous tax. But their zeal is much more fully manifested in their exertions to repair, and enlarge their Church. In the beginning of 1807, subscriptions were opened, and among themselves, with the receipt of about 400 dollars from other denominations, they raised the sum of 2200 dollars. This sum was mostly expended in building a steeple. During the present year, they have renewed their exertions, and extended their improvements. Seventeen feet have been added to the length of the building, and a complete revolution has been made in its internal structure—A new chancel, reading desk, pulpit and pews have been made—this expense, which will not be less than 1500 dollars, has been defrayed by the sale of the pews, subject to an annuity, which is to be appropriated to the salary of the Rector.

The members of the Church have now a pleasure, that they did not expect ever to enjoy—the pleasure of worshipping their God and Saviour in a commodious and pleasant building.

When the addition was made, a stone was placed at the south-east corner, with this inscription,—“ST. JOHN'S CHURCH ENLARGED AND REPAIRED, A. D. 1808.”

On placing this stone, the Rector, in the presence of many of his congregation, performed the following

OFFICE.

The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. Psalm lxxxvii. 2.

In thy fear will I worship toward thy holy temple. Psalm v. 7.

Very excellent things are spoken of thee, thou city of God. Psalm lxxxvii. 3.

Jerusalem is built as a city that is at unity with itself. Psalm cxxii. 2.

O pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee. Psalm cxxii. 6.

For my brethren and companions sake, I will wish thee prosperity. Yea because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek to do thee good. Psalm cxxii. 7, 8.

O how amiable are thy dwellings, thou Lord of hosts. Psalm lxxxiv. 1.

Let us pray,

Our Father, &c.

O Lord God, Maker of all things, Judge of all men; without whom we can do nothing; except thou build the house, their labour is but lost that build it. For thine infinite mercies, we humbly beseech thee to hear our supplications, in behalf of this our undertaking to enlarge and improve the outward condition of this thy holy temple—Grant, O God, that her walls may indeed be salvation, and her gates praise. As we begin these additions and improvements to thine house, enable us by thy Spirit, to build upon the foundation of thy Son our ever blessed Saviour, who is indeed a true stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation.

Preserve us, gracious Lord, in this work, from all accident and error. May all things here be done decently and in order; in perfect harmony and Christian friendship; in the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace.

Lord, we beseech thee to keep thy household, the Church, in continual godliness; cleanse, defend and preserve her evermore; and may her members joyfully serve thee, in all godly quietness, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.



Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works begun, continued and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name, and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.



*[In imitation of the Bible Society of Philadelphia, the Managers of the following Society are taken from the City of New-York, for the obvious purpose of ensuring their ready and punctual co-operation. The benefits of the institution are designed to extend through the Country, and we therefore recommend it to general patronage.]*

*An ADDRESS, and the CONSTITUTION, of the BIBLE and COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY, established in the City of New-York, A. D. 1809.*

#### ADDRESS.

**T**O prove the utility of a society for distributing the Bible and Book of Common Prayer, it can only be necessary to suggest the importance of these volumes, and to state the fact, that many from poverty, or other causes, are destitute of them. The duty of establishing means for their distribution will be an obvious consequence.

The Bible claims veneration as the oldest HISTORY extant; containing an account of the origin and destination of man, and of many other interesting facts, for which we search in vain among uninspired records. Tracing the events of the early ages of the world, it unfolds to us the laws, policy, and history of a people, who were established by the miraculous agency of the Most High; and who still remain amidst the ruins of contemporary empires, a monument of his power, and a striking evidence of the divine character of that volume which predicted their varying fortunes, and their present unparalleled condition.

The series of PROPHECY laid open to us in the Bible renders

it still further an object of the highest veneration. The character and fate of individuals, the rise and fall of nations, were clearly delineated in the sacred volume, long before they appeared on the stage of the world. And one most interesting personage, predicted in the beginning, as the Saviour of fallen man, occupied the strains of prophecy until his glorious manifestation in the flesh. Then the Church which he established became the theme of prophetic inspiration, displaying its history, and the important changes of the world, subservient to it, until the final period when its militant state shall be exchanged for its triumphant state in heaven.

In all the events and characters recorded or predicted in the sacred volume, man is intimately concerned. For its distinguishing excellence and authority consist, in its being the REVELATION OF THE WILL OF GOD. From it is derived whatever portion of religious truth adorns the pages of that philosophy which is sometimes set up in opposition to it. In the Bible alone we find revealed the consoling truth, that "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself;" in it alone are "life and immortality brought to light." Whatever view, therefore, we take of the Bible, it commands our highest reverence, and our implicit faith. For "there is depth enough therein to exercise the wise, and plainness enough to instruct the weak." And, still more justly to characterize it, in the words of an eminent scholar,\* who devoted to it his most serious attention—"It has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter."

These are excellencies of the sacred volume familiar to Christians, and which, to be duly appreciated, require only to be mentioned. But are those Christians who revere their Bible as bearing the stamp of divine authority, and cherish it as the only basis of their immortal hopes, aware that there are numbers wholly ignorant of its truths? Such is the lamentable fact. Many are the abodes of wretchedness, which no light of consolation from this divine volume cheers. Many are the receptacles of vice, which neither the judgments of God revealed in the Bible alarm, nor his blessed promises of mercy to repenting sinners console. Not a few of those who disturb by their

\* Locke.

passions or their crimes the peace of society, have never learnt from their Bible to obey every lawful "ordinance of man for the Lord's sake;" and to practise those virtues of sobriety, contentment, and humility, which are essential to the preservation of civil order. Friends of your country! Christians! the temporal interests of your fellow men, their immortal welfare demand that you exert your efforts to disseminate among them the knowledge of God's revealed will.

And next to the BIBLE which contains this revealed will, those who have established this society have been accustomed to revere the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. This book, containing much of the pious sentiment and language which animated primitive martyrs, and in which they poured forth to their God and Saviour, their prayers and praises, was compiled by the care and labour of the Fathers of the Reformation in the Church of England. Universally admired for its simplicity and its pathos, it is acknowledged even by many who reject it, to be an affecting and correct display of evangelical doctrine, and to breathe the pure emotions of the devout soul. What better method then can be adopted to disseminate the truths of the Bible, than by dispersing a book which, exhibiting these truths in the affecting language of devotion, impresses them on the heart as well as on the understanding?

Is this book in the hands of all who value it? The contrary is the fact. The Clergy in the city are often applied to by their poor parishioners, for a Book of Common Prayer. Many also would prize it, and would improve it as a gift, who will not go to the expense of purchasing it. These remarks are obviously more applicable to parishes in the country, particularly to those which are forming in new settlements. From these quarters, the calls are frequent for this admirable summary of evangelical truth.

The importance and duty of advancing Christian knowledge, by the dissemination of Bibles, Common Prayer Books, and religious tracts, have been long confessed among Christians generally, and particularly in Great-Britain. There, large sums of money are annually expended in promoting these objects. In a new country, it is of immense consequence, even in a civil point of view, that religious and moral principle should keep pace with the increase of population and wealth. In regard



to the eternal interests of man, the importance of this truth rises above all calculation.

Christians! your sympathy is often awakened for the bodies of men. Have compassion on their souls. Minister to their spiritual health. Provide for their eternal welfare. At the last day an inquiry will be instituted,—Have ye fed the hungry? Have ye clothed the naked? Remember! a more important inquiry will be,—Have ye fed the hungry with the bread of life? Have ye clothed the naked with the garments of salvation?

The earnest prayer is offered to him who holds in his hand the hearts of all men, that he would dispose Christians to aid an institution, humbly devoted to his glory, with the means of permanently and extensively diffusing the knowledge of his holy word.

### CONSTITUTION.

1. EVERY person who pays two dollars at the time of subscribing, and two dollars annually afterwards, shall be a Member of the Society. The payment of fifty dollars, or more, at the time of subscribing, shall entitle a person to be a Member for life, without any further contribution.

2. The contributions, at the time of subscribing, with such donations as may be received from benevolent individuals, shall be the permanent fund of the Society, and not subject to disbursement. The interest of the permanent fund, with the annual contributions, shall be appropriated to the purchase and distribution of Bibles, and Common Prayer Books, and, when deemed expedient, of religious tracts.

3. The business of the Society shall be conducted by a Board of Managers, consisting of the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church resident in the city of New-York; and of ten Laymen, to be chosen annually by ballot, by the Members present, on the first Tuesday after the 24th of February, the festival of St. Matthias. The Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of New-York shall be President of the Society and of the Board of Managers, and, in his absence, a Chairman shall be appointed. The Board of Managers shall meet on the day after the annual meeting, to choose from their

own number a Secretary and Treasurer; and shall meet afterwards according to their own rules. Seven of the Managers shall constitute a quorum to do business. The Board of Managers shall make all laws necessary for the government of the Society, and shall cause a statement of the receipts and expenditures of money, with such other matters as they may deem proper, to be laid before the Members of the Society at the annual meetings.

4. On the day of the annual meeting of the Society, the *morning or evening prayer* shall be celebrated, and a suitable *sermon* preached; after which a collection shall be made, to be appropriated to the funds of the Society. The Preacher shall be appointed at the first meeting of the Board of Managers subsequent to the annual meeting, by the Bishop, or, in case of his absence, by their Chairman. And the Bishop or Chairman shall also appoint the time and place of service; of both which, as well as of the annual meeting, public notice shall be given by the Secretary.

5. The Constitution of the Society shall be unalterable, except by a vote of two-thirds of the Board of Managers, and a concurrent vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Society present at the annual meeting.

### MANAGERS.

(Until the Annual Election.)

The Right Rev. Bishop MOORE, President.

The Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the City of New-York.

MATTHEW CLARKSON.

HENRY ROGERS.

THOMAS HARVEY.

GEORGE DOMINICK.

JACOB LE ROY.

WILLIAM BAYARD.

JOHN ONDERDONK.

DAVID B. OGDEN.

JOHN SLIDELL.

GULIAN LUDLOW, Treasurer.

REV. THOMAS LYELL, Secretary.

## THOUGHTS ON MIDNIGHT.

*By Mrs. Carter.*

WHILE night in solemn shade invests the pole,  
 And calm reflection soothes the pensive soul;  
 While reason undisturb'd asserts her sway,  
 And life's deceitful colours fade away:  
 To thee ! all-conscious prescence ! I devote  
 This peaceful interval of sober thought.  
 Here all my better faculties confine,  
 And be this hour of sacred silence thine.

If by the day's illusive scenes misled,  
 My erring soul from virtue's path has stray'd:  
 If by example snar'd, by passion warm'd,  
 Some false delight my giddy sense has charm'd,  
 My calmer thoughts the wretched choice reprove,  
 And my best hopes are center'd in thy love.  
 Depriv'd of this, can life one joy afford!  
 Its utmost boast a vain unmeaning word.

But ah ! how oft my lawless passions rove,  
 And break those awful precepts I approve !  
 Pursue the fatal impulse I abhor,  
 And violate the virtue I adore !  
 Oft when thy gracious Spirit's guardian care  
 Warn'd my fond soul to shun the tempting snare,  
 My stubborn will his gentle aid repress,  
 And check'd the rising goodness in my breast,  
 Mad with vain hopes, or urg'd by false desires,  
 Still'd his soft voice, and quench'd his sacred fires.

With grief oppress, and prostrate in the dust,  
 Should'st thou condemn, I own the sentence just.  
 But oh ! thy softer titles let me claim,  
 And plead my cause by Mercy's gentle name.  
 Mercy, that wipes the penitential tear,  
 And dissipates the horrors of despair:  
 From rig'rous justice steals the vengeful hour;  
 Softens the dreadful attribute of power ;



Disarms the wrath of an offended God,  
And seals my pardon in a Saviour's blood.

All pow'rful grace, exert thy gentle sway,  
And teach my rebel passions to obey :  
Lest lurking folly with insidious art  
Regain my volatile inconstant heart.  
Shall ev'ry high resolve devotion frames,  
Be only lifeless sounds and specious names ?  
Or rather, while thy hopes and fears control,  
In this still hour each motion of my soul,  
Secure its safety by a sudden doom,  
And be the soft retreat of sleep my tomb.  
Calm let me slumber in that dark repose,  
Till the last morn its orient beam disclose :  
Then, when the great Archangel's potent sound  
Shall echo through creation's ample round,  
Wak'd from the sleep of death, with joy survey  
The op'ning splendours of eternal day.

#### ERRATA IN THE FIFTH VOLUME.

- Page 415, note, line 4, for "when" read "whom."  
418, line 19, after "could" insert "not."  
422, line 25, for the first "of" read "and."  
424, line 15, for "profers" read "prefers."  
425, note, line 2, for "Scripture" read "Scriptures."